THE Mennonite Quarterly Review

BOARD OF EDITORS
HAROLD S. BENDER, *Goshen College*, Editor
GUY F. HERSHBERGER, *Goshen College*
EDWARD YODER, *Goshen College*
CHRISTIAN NEFF, *Weierhof, Germany*
JOHN UMBLE, *Goshen College*
ERNST CORRELL, *American University*
BENJAMIN UNRUH, *Karlsruhe, Germany*

VOLUME XI JULY, 1937 NUMBER THREE

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL 170

CHRISTIANITY AND THE STATE 171
Edward Yoder

MENNONITE IMMIGRATION INTO MANITOBA: SOURCES AND DOCUMENTS, 1872, 1873 196
Ernst Correll

THE CHURCH AGAINST THE WORLD: A REVIEW 228
Guy F. Hershberger

EDITORIAL

Jesus said of His disciples, "They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world." One of the most difficult and serious questions that has faced the church throughout its history has been the question of the meaning and application of this profound principle. Out of it arise such major questions as the relation of the individual Christian to his non-Christian neighbor, the participation of the Christian in institutions of society and the relation of Christianity to the state. In our day this last great fundamental issue has become an urgent question as the church faces the totalitarian state in various countries. The Anabaptist-Mennonite movement from its very inception took a definite position on the question of the relationship of Christianity to the state and has maintained it to a large extent to the present day. But large question marks have been placed about this position by certain members of the various Mennonite groups, as well as by some branches of the church as a whole. The Mennonite Church of today must think through thoroughly its historic tradition on this issue. It has made a definite commitment to follow the mind of Christ as found in the passage quoted above as well as in other passages, but it must clarify the import of its commitment in practice. Dr. Edward Yoder's careful and well-tempered examination of certain aspects of this complex problem as contained in his lengthy article in the current issue, is a helpful contribution to the thinking which must be done. It does not profess to present the final solution, but merely suggests some lessons from history which may stimulate fruitful discussion.

An important contribution to the consideration of the larger problem of the Christian's relation to the world order, of which the problem discussed by Edward Yoder is a subordinate aspect, is to be found in a noteworthy book by three American theologians, entitled The Church Against the World. Dr. Hershberger's review gives a concise summary of the challenging message which it contains, with its fresh and invigorating approach.

In few, if any periods, has Anabaptist and Mennonite History been without the experience of one of the groups being forced out of the home and homeland and sent into the wilderness or across national boundaries to begin life anew. The religious and ethical aspects of these dynamic changes require little space for exposition. I Peter 3:13-17 expresses the deeper meaning simply. Similarly, the principle of separation from the world, another predominating historic lever in Mennonite life, is clearly found in II Corinthians 6, and Romans 12. When, however, concrete factual data regarding these matters are looked for, attention must be directed to general topics of various kinds such as: the characterization of the particular conflicts with political authorities; an evaluation of the principles of tolerance operating under new auspices; a knowledge of land prospecting activities; an insight into negotiations for the securing of new articles of settlement; a study of the technical complexity of immigration and emigration, and of the changing methods of pioneering on new soil; an understanding and appreciation of brotherhood assistance, more or less institutionalized, but never without certain forceful leaders in faith and fellowship service. Investigations of this nature introduce specific statistical, legal, sociological, and economic data which, under the diligent scholarship of a growing group of students, are becoming more and more valuable in the writing of Anabaptist and Mennonite history.

The *Mennonite Quarterly Review* and *The Studies in Mennonite and Anabaptist History*, through their editorial principles, desire to set standards in this work which will accord with the methods and forms of analysis used in historical and social science research studies elsewhere. The *Mennonitisches Lexikon* of Christian Hege and Christian Neff (the second volume of which was issued recently), reflects in summary fashion what has been accomplished along these lines. Attention is here directed to Hege's article, "Geschichtschreibung," which describes distinctly the past and present practices in Anabaptist and Mennonite historiography, and shows how for centuries it had remained conditioned by state and church condemnations placed upon the movement in and long after its initial period. No longer, of course, is Anabaptist-Mennonite historiography tied up with and handicapped by the prejudice and bias which grew out of official condemnation. Yet the fair and objective approach taken for granted in most other historical fields still requires a certain emphasis, or at least a more conscious, if

(Continued on page 232)

THE
Mennonite Quarterly
Review

VOLUME XI JULY, 1937 NUMBER THREE

CHRISTIANITY AND THE STATE*

Edward Yoder

The approach to this discussion of the subject will be chiefly from the historical side. There are other possible lines of approach, but this one is as suitable as any. The problem of the relation of Christianity to the state has been a continuous one from the time Christianity first took on a corporate form of expression in the organized church. Various attempts have been made to effect solutions for this perennial problem. To know something of these attempts is to gain a little light on the problem, which should enable one to think more clearly and intelligently upon the subject. It is the writer's hope that this discussion, while it will give some attention to the side of theory, may yet keep its feet on the earth sufficiently to make it practical and worth while.

It is noteworthy that after nineteen centuries of experiment and struggle the problem of the relation of Church and state is by no means settled today. In fact, there has been a greatly increased volume of discussion in recent years, due principally to the appearance of the idea of the totalitarian state in Italy and Germany, countries where the Church has been asked to lend its support to the particular type of political philosophy that is in the ascendency. However much it becomes entangled with worldly affairs, the Church is always conscious that it is a society outside the sphere of political

* An address delivered before the Goshen College Peace Society, December, 1936.

arrangements, that it is not an integral part of the social and cultural order of the day. But the supine helplessness of the Church in the face of a crisis, such as was revealed during the World War, has smitten the conscience of many a Christian thinker and church leader, and has led to much searching of heart and reflection on the subject. For these reasons the subject of Christianity and its relation to the state is today a live one, and one on which every Christian should be able to think with some intelligence and clarity. Such thinking is essential on the part of every Christian, because the problem, as already stated, is still unsolved, and perhaps can never be ideally solved to the extent that no individual decisions need to be made at some time or other.[1]

It is well to bear in mind that in the time of the New Testament and of early Christianity the state as such was hardly distinguished from the world, or the entire non-Christian sphere of life. And between the Christian and the non-Christian spheres of life there exists by definition an inevitable state of tension which can never be wholly and permanently resolved. More will be brought out on this point in the course of the discussion. First we shall take a glance at the nature of the two things we are considering.

I

What is the nature of Christianity, and what is the nature of its corporate expression known as the Church? The teachings and the work of Jesus Christ provide the basis for Christianity. We may well remind ourselves that Christianity is essentially a thing of the spirit, a spiritual force at work in the world. However reluctant one may be to admit the idea, it is yet true that all efforts to reduce Christianity to a corporate form, and all the attempts to formulate it into a system of thought, of ethics, of rules for living, of theology, or of religion give results which are in themselves imperfect, partial, and mingled with some inevitable error and human shortcomings.

Such attempts to give corporate expression to Christianity are in themselves good and necessary and they account for the existence

1. See Oldham, J. H., *Church, Community, and State: A World Issue* (Harper and Brothers, New York, 1935) and similar literature published by the Universal Christian Council on Life and Work in preparation for the world conference at Oxford (England), July 12-27, 1937. Compare Moberly, Sir Walter: The Oxford Conference, in *Christendom*, Vol. II, pp. 50-59.

of the organized church, of the numerous groups, bodies, and denominations of Christians in existence today. All these together may be thought to hold the divine treasure in earthen vessels, that is to say, in imperfect, defective, and temporary containers. It is possible that the more fully any particular group succeeds in embodying the spirit and nature of the divine society as Jesus intended, the more tension will exist between it and the surrounding world. Particularly is this true when this world or any significant part of it is organized into a political state with aims, goals, and values, with a philosophy and a purpose of its own. At such a time the stress and tension tend to become acute, and in the nature of things the result cannot well be otherwise.

The Church is therefore a Divine Society founded by Christ upon the earth to perpetuate His work. He represented this Divine Society as being separate from and in some sense antagonistic to the world. Membership in this Divine Society must involve individual sacrifice and personal choice. Jesus constantly speaks of it as the Kingdom of God or the Kingdom of heaven. It is a domain which men enter by an act of the will, not a realm to which they belong by birth. It does not come by outward observation, as He tells us. He also spoke once or twice about the Church, which was evidently meant to be a corporate expression of the divine society upon earth.[2]

It is pertinent to ask: Why did Jesus constantly speak of His work, of the end for which He was working, in political terms? Why call it a kingdom at all? The word kingdom in the thought and ideology of that time could suggest to the minds of men only one thing, the Roman Empire. The world-kingdom idea really began with Alexander the Great. The Romans later built directly upon that idea their program for the political unity for the world. The universalism of Christianity fitted in perfectly with the dominant political conception of that time. And it is possible that Jesus seized upon the common phraseology of the day to convey to the people of His time the concept of a higher loyalty than that given to an earthly realm. It is significant too that in the New Testament writings the apostles apply to Jesus Christ many of the precise titles of honor which the head of the Roman Empire, the Emperor, regularly received from his subjects, such titles as God, Lord, Saviour and oth-

2. Hobhouse, Walter, *The Church and the World in Idea and in History*, the Bampton Lectures for 1909 (Macmillan and Co., London, 1910), p. 15.

ers.[3] These titles appear altogether natural and commonplace in our thinking of Christ today, they are a part of our Christian vocabulary; but in the first century they carried a definite imperial, or even political flavor which impressed upon men's minds the nature of the Christian church as the realm of God to which was due a spiritual and moral allegiance second to none. Though Jesus thus spoke in borrowed political terms of His work, yet He stedfastly refused all suggestions of using political methods to accomplish His work, so emphasizing the spiritual nature of His kingdom.

And what is the state? We need not attempt any philosophical answers to this question at this time. In fact, it is questionable if one can speak of the state as an objective entity that has an existence outside of or apart from the people who compose it. It is not a mystical something that works by laws and principles of its own. The mediaeval thinker Abelard, following Aristotle, is said to have argued out of countenance the notion that there is reality in generalities. The state as a generality, an objective something, does not exist.[4] Even a monarch as Louis XIV sensed the practical answer to the question when he uttered his well known words, "L'Etat, C'est moi." Certain modern dictators are at pains to demonstrate that the state exists as an entity above and apart to which men are asked to enslave themselves. But these modern efforts, as we shall note more fully below, are really a reversion to the ancient pagan idea of the state. The state is an aggregation of free individuals united for collective action. This would probably cover the modern conception of the state—at least the democratic view—which is also approximately the Christian view.

The ancient pagan notion on the matter was that the state is a super-person, itself divine by nature and ruled by divine kings or nobles. Professor Ferraro has named this pagan idea the "Pharaoh

---

3. Deissmann, A., *Light From the Ancient East* (Engl. tr., 1927, Geo. H. Doran Co., New York), pp. 343-378. Professor Deissmann traces the parallelism in nomenclature of the imperial cultus and Christianity at some length. For brief discussions on the relation of the Church to the Roman Empire, see Westcott, B. F., *The Epistles of St. John* (Macmillan and Co., 1909), pp. 250-282; Hobhouse, *op. cit.*, Ch. II. Fuller treatment of the subject may be found in Ramsay, Sir William, *The Church in the Roman Empire* (London, 1893); Hardy, E. G., *Christianity and the Roman Government* (The Macmillan Co., New York, 1925).

4. Bell, Bernard Iddings, *Common Sense in Education* (William Morrow and Co., New York, 1928), pp. 271-275.

spirit" of the ancient world.[5] The only means, he adds, discovered by that ancient world for insuring political and social order was to set authority above all dispute by investing it with divinity. Since the state was divine, it was an end in itself, its subjects existed for it and not the reverse. In fact the individual enjoyed no real existence. He might be used by the state, sacrificed for the state or the head of the state at its pleasure and convenience. Even the otherwise enlightened cultures of Greece and Rome made only very slight progress against this Pharaoh spirit of the ancient world.

As a matter of fact the Roman Empire was definitely moving away from earlier republican ideas in the direction of the Pharaoh spirit during the first century of its existence. The Roman imperial government dates from the year 27 B. C. The full machinery of imperial administration, though first couched in republican forms, was rather gradually elaborated during the first Christian century. This work had not advanced far until the definite need was felt for an imperial religion. The basic idea of world unity required the element of religion to re-enforce and undergird it. Especially in the East was this need felt, in that part of the world where the Pharaoh idea about government had so long dominated men's minds. In response to this felt need, the cult of the Emperors, who served as the concrete embodiment of the State, was gradually developed. And interestingly enough the strongest centers of emperor worship were apparently not in Italy nor the lands nearest Rome, but in Asia Minor and Egypt.

During the early Christian centuries therefore and up to the time of the Emperor Constantine, the Church and the Empire stood for opposite ideas in the realm of religion. The Church was pursuing its own divine mission of spreading the Christian gospel over the world, without any regard for the social or political consequences of her doctrine. Her corporate development, as almost a state within a state, was slow. The government gradually began to see in the growing strength of the Church a movement hostile to its own existence. The attitude of the state toward Christianity, beginning from the time that the Christian movement was first distinguished from Judaism, was that of persecutor, suppressing it sporadically with vigour and again leaving it in comparative peace. The Church

5. Ferraro, Guglielmo, *Peace and War* (Engl. tr., 1933; Macmillan and Co.), pp. 185-187. See also Cadman, S. Parkes, *Christianity and the State* (The Macmillan Co., New York, 1924), pp. 88-91.

on the other hand claimed no rights for itself, it took the attitude of suffering for righteousness, being martyred for the testimony of the Christ as her Lord even as He had suffered. The regard of the Christians for the state before Constantine was more or less negative, wavering, as Heering notes, between aversion and some slight recognition of the state's justice and usefulness, though for the most part remaining in ascetic, heroic indifference.[6]

It was thus Christianity that constituted the grand challenge to this Pharaoh spirit of the ancient world.[7] The fundamental concept that the individual man is not the slave of any man even though that man claims to be a divine ruler, but that he must be the servant of God alone, this idea sounded the death knell of all State worship, Caesar worship, and their like. To quote a few sentences from Ferraro: "All the greatness of the white races comes from that sublime Judaeo-Christian idea whose light was shed over the world from Palestine through the agency of the Bible and the great teachers of the Pharisees. Through its influence the State lost its divine character and put itself at the service of mankind; the spirit of criticism and the desire for better things were given the freedom of the world; the thirst for truth and justice increased with every effort made to quench it."[8]

Bearing in mind then the ancient Pharaoh idea of the state, together with its implications, it may help us to grasp the reasons for the persecution directed against the Church by the Roman imperial government, beginning under Nero about the year 65 and ending two hundred and fifty years later with Constantine's edict of toleration. Much discussion has been devoted to the question of why the Roman government persecuted the Christians. It is known that the ancient world was tolerant of religions and the Roman Empire too was very tolerant in this respect. Just one additional religion among the many that were sweeping over the Empire during the first centuries after Augustus Caesar had established the principate, could hardly have attracted the official notice of the imperial government. As Wm. Ramsay remarks, the average citizen of the Empire cared not two straws whether his neighbor worshiped twenty

---

6. Heering, G. J., *The Fall of Christianity* (Engl. tr., 1930; London, George Allen and Unwin), p. 62.

7. Cadman points out the earlier influence of philosophy, particularly of the Stoic and Epicurean schools, in the same direction, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

8. Ferraro, *op. cit.*, p. 191.

or twenty-one gods, one more or one less.[9] Even the cult of the Emperor had not been designed to displace any existing forms of worship.

For some people it may be quite enough to say that Satan was trying to destroy the infant Christian Church. For those who are more curious about immediate causes in history it is necessary to examine the matter more closely. And this has been done at great length by many writers at different times. The whole matter seems to sift itself down to about this, that Christianity, while it was not revolutionary in the common direct political sense of the word, was utterly revolutionary in the realm of ideas. The Christian gospel with its evangel of love, brotherhood, divine sonship, did attack indirectly the Pharaoh spirit, which outside of Jewish circles, was widely dominant. Careful students of that period of history have stated the conflict of that time as due to the fact that the Church constituted practically a state within a state, which amounted to a direct threat against the leading policy of the Roman Empire, namely, that of maintaining one all-comprehensive unity, which unity was the Empire.[10] As we know from history the religious idea for which Christianity stood triumphed in the end, and it did so, not by political might or worldly power, but by the inner spiritual force, by the divine force that operated through it.

After the time of Constantine the old pagan idea of the state lay in the dust. The idea of man's responsibility to God had triumphed in name at least over the pagan concept of the state as embodying ultimate values. The state had now to find its place among the subsidiary forces in the world, as the instrument of society and of the individual, instead of itself being the end of all existence. The question of its exact relation to the Church in practice became a troublesome question, that engaged the attention of thinkers. St. Augustine in his famous work *de civitate Dei, On the City of God,* attempted a synthesis that has decidedly influenced Christian thinking on the subject of Church and state since his day.[11]

Augustine set forth the idea that there are two domains that comprise between them the whole of the world, two cities or states as he calls them, the heavenly and the earthly communities, the

9. Ramsay, *op. cit.,* pp. 12, 130.

10. So, for example, Ramsay, *op. cit., passim;* Sihler, E. G., in The Biblical Review, Vol. 5, p. 255 (April, 1920); Hobhouse, *op. cit.,* pp. 41-69.

11. Cadman, *op. cit.,* pp. 204-207.

civitas Dei and the *civitas terrena.* Along with this division of domain he also emphasized the universal sovereignty and providence of God. The rule of God in the *civitas Dei* is direct and immediate while that over the earthly realm of the state is permissive and by providential overruling. There is in Augustine's work a strong note of the dualistic concept that was evident in much of the Christian thinking of his time, namely that the world, of which the earthly state was the literal embodiment, was essentially evil in its origin and its nature. He made room in his attempted synthesis for righteous wars under the permissive providence of God. "Wars", he says, "may be waged by the command of God. He who engages in these wars does not break the Sixth Commandment" (I. 21). "Even if lust for earthly domination and glory was the goal of Roman rule, this very desire restrained other greater mischief" (V. 12, 13).[12]

This conception was naturally wavering and ambiguous, and unsatisfactory in practice. A more systematic unity of thought on the subject was finally worked out by Thomas Aquinus in the thirteenth century. He gave to the state a well-defined place and function in the vast organism of Christian social life. He made it a necessary part of the *corpus christianum.* The Church and the state together, in the mind of Thomas, formed the kingdom of God, that is the Church and state work like the right and left hands of God in performing His work in the world. The strife of the Middle Ages between princes and Popes or between Emperor and Pope was not so much a struggle between the state and the Church as two conflicting and rival theories of values as it was a conflict for the supremacy between two parts of the *corpus Christianum* considered as a single society. As Heering says: "Both for the medieval Catholic Church, and for the reformers, the State and Church, social, cultural and religious life formed a unity of thought, an organization regarded as Christian, a *corpus Christianum.*" Walter Hobhouse points out the same fact, that in the mediaeval time church and state were not pictured as two separate societies but as one. "The idea of Church and State as two completely independent societies was developed later or rather revived later, for it was a reversion to the earliest principles of Christianity, which had been completely obscured in the mediaeval mind."[13]

12. St. Augustin's *City of God,* tr. by Marcus Dods, in Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, edited by Philip Schaff (Scribners, New York, 1903).
13. Heering, *op. cit.,* p. 73; Hobhouse, *op. cit.,* p. 196, cf. p. 223.

With the Reformation, sometimes called the Protestant revolt of Western Europe, the unity of Christendom was shattered. The *corpus Christianum* suffered a serious breach. The Reformers were under the influence of the dominant idea, suggested first by Augustine and finally systematized by Thomas, that society in a nominally Christian nation is a unity, consisting of a religious phase and a political phase, of a spiritual and of a worldly realm. Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli struggled with the problems involved, but their efforts resulted rather in redefinitions of the problem than in solutions of its difficulties. In effect they all identified the state with the rule of the prince in every particular district. The leading Reformers all regarded the political state as in some way an alley in the work of the kingdom of God. Naturally and all unwittingly they placed the power and sanction of religion behind the then budding idea which has since flowered out in the western world in the rampant nationalism with which we are familiar.[14]

Luther was unable to free himself from the mediaeval conception of Church and state, that they were merely two aspects of the same society. He in fact put the civil power before the spiritual. He gave to the "godly prince" supreme coercive power in the religious as well as in the civil sphere. The Church under his arrangement did all it could to make men orthodox and good Christians, and any who did not respond to the methods the Church could employ, were left to the civil power to convert or punish. Melanchthon taught that the civil magistrates must not be merely the guardians of peace and plenty, but must suppress heresy, and that not as being a danger to the state, but simply as theological error. Zwingli acknowledged no practical distinction between Church and state. In his view the civil rulers possessed spiritual functions and they were bound to promote uniformity of belief among members of the community, on pain of forfeiting their office.[15]

Calvin held that the support of religion was the chief office of the state. He did not however, like Zwingli, subject the Church to the State, but the State to the Church. His system approximates in form a direct theocracy. The government at Geneva was charged with the suppression of heresy as well as with the purification of morals.[16] These reformers were all able to defend the positions they

14. Hobhouse, *op. cit.*, pp. 223, 228; cf. also pp. 259-261.
15. *Ibid.*, pp. 226, 227.
16. *Ibid.*, pp. 228, 229.

took with Scripture passages. That they were able to do so is explained by the fact that they went chiefly to the Old Testament and left the New Testament and its teachings fall well into the background of their teaching.

The Anabaptists of that time held the New Testament to be the chief guide for the Christians and for the Church. For them the latter could have no connection with the state at all. The state's work was recognized as a part of the providence of God, but entirely outside His kingdom of grace. The Church does not need the arm of the state at all in its work and service. In effect, they turned back to the early Christian attitude of indifference to the state and to the political arrangements of society. If all men would live by the Gospel there would be no need for a state with police and military power, and they proceeded to live that way.

About the same time that the *corpus Christianum* received a blow from the outside in the Protestant revolt, it suffered another blow from within, that is, in the realm of political theory. This came from the doctrine of political expediency as developed and taught by the Italian political philosopher, Machiavelli. This philosopher frankly revived the old pagan doctrine that the state is the highest good, that the state is everything, and the individual is nothing. Political necessity may and on occasion must transcend all moral considerations. Machiavelli opposed Christian beliefs because they stood in the way of his theory, because, as he said, they made men submissive, unmanly, and weak.[17] This doctrine was being propounded at the same time that the Reformers worked out their syntheses of Church and state. The parallel impulse of the two doctrines have unintentionally worked together to produce modern nationalism which threatens to destroy western civilization, as modern states go on applying Machiavellian doctrine, being abetted in their course by a type of Christian ideology that goes back through Luther to Thomas Aquinus and Augustine. Perhaps it is no accident that an Italian and a German are today among the world's chief exponents of the totalitarian state.

It may be of interest here in passing to observe Professor Ferraro's interpretation of the course of political events in the West since the sixteenth century. He too emphasizes the reversion to the old pagan theory of the state in modern times. It has been the com-

17. Heering, *op. cit.*, pp. 128, 129.

mon custom to speak of the Renaissance as a great awakening after a long and barren dark age. Various thinkers have challenged this interpretation of the Renaissance, and insist that, in some respects at least, it was a period of decadence. Even in literature and art this is asserted to be true, and Ferraro insists it is true in politics and government.[18] He thinks the interest men had in unearthing the old Greek and Roman books lay in the fact that those old books could teach Europe how to wage war and frame governments. His emphasis may be one-sided, but it suggests something to think upon. Quoting from Ferraro:

"Christianity, making the perfection and the salvation of the individual its chief concern, had demilitarized Europe and stifled the military spirit. The ancients, on the other hand, had created a great political and military civilization; even after the lapse of so many centuries, therefore, their governments and their armies could supply a pattern for a civilization which had lost the arts of politics and war. Europe's infatuation for the Greeks and Romans dates from the sixteenth century, when she began her great political and military reorganization. She admired them in all things, even those arts in which the Middle Ages had excelled them, because they taught her how to organize armies, how to wage wars, and how to build up great States." And so this writer concludes that from the sixteenth century onwards, Western civilization was carried back towards paganism in its war and politics, while on the contrary it became more and more Christian in other respects. This fact forces us of the modern world to live in a state of permanent disharmony. "The Christian spirit in social life and manners clashes continually with the pagan spirit in war and politics."[19]

Speaking of the pagan conception of the state that today is in the ascendency in many places, we need only to read the words of Premier Mussolini to see its actuality. The Fascist watchword is: "Nothing against the state; nothing outside the state; everything for the state." Fascism conceives of the state as an absolute, in comparison with which all individuals or groups are relative, only to be conceived of in their relation to the state. Hitler's view is similar. Pacifism and humanitarianism, for example are said to be treated in

18. Cadman, *op. cit.*, p. 94; Ferraro, *op. cit.*, p. 193; Bell, *op. cit.*, pp. 29-36.

19. Ferraro, *op. cit.*, pp. 194, 199.

Hitler's regime as "a mixture of stupidity, cowardice, and superciliousness."[20]

Might it be providential that the two types of state absolutism, communism and fascism, existing today are being pitted against each other in deadly combat so that they may be destined eventually to mutually destroy each other and leave the field open for other concepts of the state and its place in society? Certainly from the Christian standpoint there is little to choose between fascism and communism as political doctrines. It is devoutly to be hoped that out of the conflict and confusion the professed church of Christ may recover its proper independence and may learn to tend to its own business.

The separation of Church and state as it is found in the United States is, of course, a still different arrangement, different from both the medieval and the Reformation syntheses, and one that seems to many to be ideal. In practice it has many good points and also its dangers. The moral restraint upon state policy is very feeble and uncertain; the tendency everywhere is for the state to consider itself supra-moral. In times of national crisis the Church has proven itself practically helpless to testify against war and has allowed itself to be used by the state to promote the war spirit and support state policy. The Constitution has at times been interpreted to mean that a man who places conscience above the orders of his government is not qualified to become a citizen.

It needs to be emphasized that the Church of Christ must not and dare not accept any defined status from the state that in any way ties her hands for testifying against sin and unrighteousness, in any place where these may be found, whether in individual life, in group life, in economic or political life. The situation that has developed in America is about like this: The state agrees not to molest the Church in her doctrine and worship. Then the Church tends to feel perhaps that it would be ungenerous of her in turn not to let the state alone in its policies, or not to support the state in a time of its crisis and danger.

There remain today a few tokens that look like an agreement between Church and state. One is that church property is exempt from public taxation. If the state extends such exemption gratuitously, the Church may well use it with gratitude. But she cannot demand it as a right, nor must she ever compromise her testimony

20. Lippmann, Walter, in *Atlantic Monthly*, Vol. 158, p. 734 (December, 1936).

for Christ for the purpose of keeping up such a contract or agreement.

The separation of the Church and the state as we know it is the only arrangement the Christians can desire. "History shows us the failure both of theocracies, in which the State has been made a function of the Church, and of Erastian enterprises by which the Church has been subjected to the State. Let each power have its proper sphere and employ its proper methods. . . . It is by the recognition of their distinctness that the area of possible conflict can best be restricted. It may not be possible to ensure that no conflict shall ever arise; and in such cases the state will always have the last word, because she has material force at her disposal. . . . And the Church, if in any case she feels bound to refuse obedience in duty to a higher allegiance, must be prepared to suffer for doing so, after all, adversity, not prosperity, is the birthright promised by her Lord. There is a sense, surely, in which Luther's saying is profoundly true —"Leiden, Leiden, Kreuz, Kreuz, ist der Christen Recht—das und kein anderes'."[21]

II

We turn then to the second major phase of this subject, that of the individual Christian and his relation to the political state. This part is closely related to the first, very naturally, and overlaps with it at some points.

One would rightly expect to find some light, some help on this problem from the actual practice of Jesus, from the attitudes He Himself took toward governments and encouraged in others. Also from the apostles one may expect to learn something, men like Paul who travelled widely and had numerous contacts with officials of government. There are a number of pertinent passages in the New Testament which it is well to examine and study for light on this subject.

I have previously called attention to the fact that the more or less natural relationship between Christianity and the state is one of tension or stress. Perhaps no ideal *modus vivendi* between the two can be arrived at, at least in actual practice it has not proved possible for long. This state of tension becomes very evident and even more painful when we consider the individual Christian's per-

21. Hobhouse, *op. cit.*, p. 338.

sonal relation to the state. In the face of the inevitable dualism that faces him he may take any of three possible attitudes. He may be a Christian in name, at the same time complying with all the demands of the state without consulting his conscience about the matter. Or, on the contrary he may regard the State as worldly and sinful to which he owes no obligations as such. Or, finally he may strike a middle course between these extremes, regard the state as a temporary arrangement with which he co-operates so long as it does not ask him to violate Christian principles in any way. The Christian finds himself faced by two powers each of which makes some claim upon his loyalties. Each lays some obligations upon him which he cannot escape entirely. He may be a Christian first, but he is also by birth or otherwise a unit in a community or a state. A recent writer in *Christendom* states the matter thus: "The only worthy attitude for Christians is to admit the dualism with which they are confronted, to face with courage and clear sightedness the state of perpetual tension—to use the word of Troelsch—which this involves and to do all that in them lies to make the leaven of the Christian spirit a power in the world over against the world."[22]

Whatever may be the contractual arrangement for the time being between the Church and the state, in actual practice the individual Christian finds times when their claims on his loyalty come into direct conflict. The question comes to this: Must the individual conscience be subordinated to the common judgment of the group as embodied in the state? Is the group judgment ever to be taken as the will of God?

To set out the conflict that faces the individual Christian, it is well to contrast sharply the important points on which Christianity and of the state differ. I quote from Heering his excellent summary of these differences:[23]

(a) Christianity is essentially otherworldly, directed towards the eternal, the Kingdom of God. The state is inevitably concerned with worldly power and temporal aims.

(b) Christianity is a universal religion knowing no national preference. The state in practice serves exclusively the interests of its own people.

---

22. Zimmern, Sir Alfred, in *Christendom*, Vol. I, p. 800. For a discussion of the dualism involved, see Cadoux, C. J., *The Early Christian Attitude to War* (Headley Bros., London, 1919), pp. 211-212.

23. Heering, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

(c) Christianity, as the life of the spirit, has its vital breath in freedom. The state as a legal organization, cannot exist without resorting to force as its ultimate sanction.

(d) Christianity brings to the fore the relation between God and the human soul and so ascribes to personality an absolute value and independence of all that is of the earth. The state by its claim to ultimate loyalty is compelled to deny this priority of the personal. As Scholten remarks: "For the ancients a man was primarily a citizen of his state (*zoön politikon*), first a member of the community and only afterwards a personality. If Christianity has done anything new for political science and jurisprudence it has been to reverse this order."[24]

What was Jesus' own attitude toward the state and towards government? He had contacts with officials of a variety of governments, Jewish, Herodian, and Roman Imperial. It is perfectly clear on the one hand that He had no interest at all in the matter of the personnel and the policies of government. Toward the benevolent and paternal activities of the state He took an attitude of cooperation and obedience. On the other hand we know that He rejected the use of force and coercion for gaining any good end. The temptation to win the political kingdoms of the world with their systems of force and coercion was to Him a temptation from Satan. His explicit teaching against the use of force and violent coercion He did not qualify in any way whatsoever. He did not say it was for the disciples more than for any others. Hence by implication He condemned the use of all force, which we are told is the final basis upon which the political state rests.

The matter seems to be very well summed up by C. J. Cadoux as follows: "Jesus therefore acts towards the State . . . not as if it were objectively either a perquisite of Satan or the sacrosanct and inviolable institution of God, but on the assumption that it is merely the organization through which some section of his fellowmen choose to express and enforce their collective will. The State is thus a special form of the general concept of 'Neighbor'; and the practice of Jesus towards it and His precepts with regard to His followers' attitude to it are but special applications of His more general teaching in regard to behaviour towards men generally, whether good or bad."[25]

24. Quoted by Heering, *op. cit.*, p. 172.
25. Cadoux, C. J., *The Early Church and the World* (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1925), p. 47.

The general principle that the disciple must not disobey or disown or be ashamed of his Master by implication authorizes direct disobedience to the orders of government, as in the case of persecution or of service that involved the violation of some moral precept of Jesus. As to what Jesus thought of the state's use of coercion and penalty when honestly applied, we have no knowledge. Some suggest that He accorded to it a certain tacit and relative approval, relative to the immaturity of those who do not yet know the potency of the law of love. In the incident, however, of the woman taken in adultery, where the law prescribed death by stoning, Jesus used love as a remedial measure to supersede the customary penal measure. He did not commit Himself directly on the matter of penalties but seems to imply that there are better ways of dealing with delinquents.

It can be said further, I think, that the implication of Jesus' practice and teaching is that if men could rise to His own level of life, the time would come ultimately when governments, in so far as they involve the infliction of penalties by man on man, would come to an end. His outlook and the program He was working on included no punitive and coercive elements.

Possibly the New Testament passage that touches most directly and fully on Jesus' attitude to the State is that in Mark's Gospel (12:13-17). The statement of Jesus: "The things of the Emperor you must pay to the Emperor and the things of God pay to God," which concludes this passage has been interpreted by some to mean that Jesus Himself implied that the Christian must not allow religious scruples to interfere with his duty to the state. The circumstances of this incident are these. A composite delegation of Pharisees and Herodians came to Jesus in an attempt to catch Him up in some way, to force Him to commit Himself on a political issue, so that whichever way He might answer their question, He would involve Himself in some difficulty. After a profusive complimentary introduction they proposed the question, a specific and a practical one, "Is it right to pay the poll-tax to the Emperor or not? Should we pay it or should we not?" If He were to answer in the affirmative, He would alienate the sympathy of the common people from Him. If in the negative then the Imperial government would necessarily take notice of Him as an agitator against governmental policy.

Jesus was impatient alike at the cunning hypocrisy of His questioners and at their preoccupation with the to Him trivial and

ephemeral questions of worldly politics. The mind and thoughts of Jesus were taken up with ideas and aims ever so much higher and more important than the political arrangements of earth. We can imagine it was with a gesture of impatience perhaps that He, after looking at an imperial denarius, told them to pay to the Emperor what so manifestly belongs to him and above all else to pay to God what is His. This statement at once directs the thoughts of His hearers to a plane of ideas far above their narrow, base, and earthly viewpoint. It is the judgment of competent scholars that the entire emphasis of Jesus' words falls on the second clause of His statement. The best comment perhaps is that of the French scholar Loisy: "Jesus emphasizes the lawfulness of political power and of tribute much less than the insignificance of these things in comparison with the kingdom of heaven. . . . Let the things of this world be esteemed according to the smallness of their value, and let these duties be discharged as there is necessity; but let men know above all that the greatest thing lies elsewhere, in fidelity to the heavenly Father. It would be to falsify the thought of Jesus to suppose that the debt to Caesar is on the same plane, or that it has the same absolute value and definite character, as the duty towards God."

This saying and its context have always been recognized as of fundamental importance for discovering Jesus' attitude toward the state. It is the starting point for all subsequent discussion of the subject. Yet Jesus' answer is in a sense ambiguous, or at best noncommittal. He seems to imply the justice of Roman taxation. But nothing is said or even implied as to the duty of obeying the Emperor's commands in matters other than taxation. What all is included under "the things of the Emperor"? Some have claimed that it includes military service. There is at least no hint that Jesus regarded the Emperor as divinely appointed. Holtzmann has been cited as saying regarding the passage, that Jesus expressed "no sympathy with the Roman power, which is regarded simply as a temporary ordinance or institution like Nature, and has accordingly to be put up with."[26]

To interpret Jesus' attitude toward the state as one of essential indifference seems reasonable in the light of His utterances and His conduct. He had to be about His Father's business, as He expressed it on another occasion, and being preoccupied with the Father's

26. See Cadoux, *ibid.*, p. 39 and footnotes.

business He ignored the political arrangements of society, or regarded them as incidental and of little vital importance. The question as to why He may have been thus unconcerned is in dispute. But whatever the answer to that question is, the fact of His attitude is fairly clear.

The attitude of the apostle Paul toward political affairs has been characterized by some as indifferent.[27] The *locus classicus* in Paul's writings that deals with the matter of the state is of course Romans 13:1-6. Someone has even designated this as the crowning proof-text of a militarist theology, and the basis of the whole traditional dogma concerning the relation of Church to state. The passage seems to be an echo of Jesus' words discussed above, and it must be read in the light of them.[28] The passage is worth quoting here. The Twentieth Century New Testament has the following translation:

"Let everyone obey the supreme Authorities. For no Authority exists except by the will of God, and the existing Authorities have been appointed by God. Therefore he who sets himself against the Authorities is resisting God's appointment, and those who resist will bring a judgment upon themselves. A good action has nothing to fear from Rulers; a bad action has. Do you want to have no reason to fear the Authorities? Then do what is good, and you will win their praise. For they are God's servants appointed for your good. But, if you do what is wrong, you may well be afraid; for the sword they carry is not without meaning! They are God's servants to inflict His punishments on those who do wrong. You are bound, therefore, to obey, not only through fear of God's punishments, but also as a matter of conscience. This, too, is the reason for your paying taxes; for the officials are God's officers, devoting themselves to this special work."

Paul appears here to echo Jesus' words with an increased stress on the duty of civil obedience. He had frequently experienced in his missionary travels the benefits of Roman civil and political administration, the protection of Roman law and justice. He prized his Roman citizenship. The early years of Nero's reign, for this was the time when Paul wrote the Epistle to the Romans, were orderly

27. Deissmann, *op. cit.*, p. 339, characterizes the political attitude of the earliest Christianity generally as one of comparative indifference.

28. On the far-reaching influence of Paul's words, see Cadoux, *The Early Church and the World*, p. 112 and footnote 2.

and beneficent; peace and good government prevailed, the evil side of the Emperor's character had not yet developed, and the Christian faith had not been proscribed as illegal. In fact Paul seems to have felt that the Gospel might be given legal recognition by the Empire in due time. These facts may explain the one-sided and emphatic form in which the matter is stated here by Paul. No cases of possible conflict between government orders and Christian duty are provided against. Cadoux concludes that Paul was writing with the special object of counteracting a dangerous tendency on the part of a set of fractions enthusiasts in the Roman church, who by attitudes of indiscretion toward a pagan government might prejudice the officials at the capital against the new faith before its status in the Empire had been defined.[29]

The government which Paul has in mind, to which he ascribes a divine origin, was of course a pagan government, as we must always remember. And yet there is no suggestion that the "power" or "authority" is a super-moral authority with the right to coerce the Christian conscience. No more may be deduced from the passage than the right of the civil authority to maintain order with a police-force, which will restrain the evil-doer and bring him before a responsible judge. The passage is at most Paul's apology for a system of civil government, which lies outside the order of grace as revealed by Christ.

In declaring that the existing authorities are such by divine appointment the apostle means no more probably than to say that they are a part of the natural order of the world, somewhat similar to the tides of the ocean, the weather and atmospheric conditions, and the like.[30] He sees in the punitive and judicial functions of government a phase of the divine wrath and judgment against unrighteousness and sin. Nothing at all is said or implied in this passage as to the propriety of Christians acting as the agents of God's wrath either in their private capacity or as officials of the government. The

29. Cadoux, *Early Church and the World*, p. 113; see also his *Early Christian Attitude*, pp. 221, 222.

30. The German poet Schiller compares political disturbances to natural phenomena, and suggests how men adapt themselves to the same, in *Wilhelm Tell*, lines 424-429:

> Wenn sich der Föhn erhebt aus seinen Schlünden,
> Löscht man die Feuer aus, die Schiffe suchen
> Eilends den Hafen, und der mächt'ge Geist
> Geht ohne Schaden spurlos über die Erde.
> Ein jeder lebe still bei sich daheim;
> Dem Friedlichen gewährt man gern den Frieden.

idea of Christians participating in the government was not in Paul's mind at all, it probably never occurred to his mind. It was a pagan government he had in view, altogether outside of the order to which Christians belonged.

Especially is it absurd to conclude from the passage that the punitive, judicial, and military activities of government are lawful for a Christian to take part in. Paul negatived this idea in the lines just preceding the passage and again in those just following. Chapter divisions in the Bible are purely arbitrary and are sometimes misleading. There is no real break in the line of Paul's thought at the end of the twelfth chapter of Romans. He has just given a series of practical instructions to Christians to practice love, forbearance, forgiveness, peace, doing good, and overcoming evil with good. In the lines following he again states the principle that governs Christians, "Love does not work ill to one's neighbor; therefore the full satisfaction of the law is Love."

It seems therefore that Paul, like his Lord and Master, was essentially indifferent toward the policies and personnel of worldly government. His mind and his life were filled utterly with the great mission to which he knew he had been called. He was working on God's program for mankind and the world. Whatever benefits he derived from his Roman citizenship and from the administration of Roman law and justice, he gratefully accepted as providential, and not as something that the government owed to him as a right. He never directly appealed to the law for revenge or justice on his enemies. Even his appeal to the Emperor Nero in 59 cannot be viewed as an appeal for judgment against his enemies, for upon his arrival he told the Jews at Rome that he has nothing of which to accuse his nation.[31] Paul's mind was set on getting to Rome in some way and it is possible that he wished to appeal to the Emperor in person for a legalized status for the Gospel in the Empire and freedom for its preaching.

The chief reference by Paul in later writings to government and rulers is in First Timothy 2:1-3, where he urges prayer for the officials, so that Christians be unmolested, and so unhindered in spreading the message of salvation to all men according to God's will. Peter wrote his Epistles in a time of persecution. He instructs Christians to submit to the various officials of government who pun-

31. See *Acts* 25:10-12; 28:17-19.

ish the evil and reward the good. This sounds like the language of Paul in Romans. But Peter emphasizes the point that political government is a human institution: "Submit to all human institutions," he says. (First Peter 2:13-17). In a later chapter he says to the Christians: "Let none of you suffer as a murderer, or a thief, or an evil-doer, or a busybody." The meaning of the last word is in doubt. It is a very rare word, and some find reason for translating it "a revolutionary." This meaning would be less of an anti-climax in the sentence than the other, more on the same level of ideas, and hence is a fair possibility. The language of both Peter and Paul would seem to point to the existence among Christians of a tendency to act upon the teaching of freedom in Christ, and to abuse the liberty that was taught them.[32]

Some profess to see reflected in John's writings, First John and The Revelation, an attitude of strong dislike or hostility against the government of the time. The writer of Revelation sees in the powers that persecute the saints the immediate agents of Satan. The government of Rome and the Emperor may be alluded to under the symbols of the various beasts and the great harlot. In the Epistle persecution is not alluded to directly, yet the writer does not leave us in doubt as to the feeling with which he regarded the state. The state is summed up in "The World". As Bishop Westcott says: "In the Emperor 'the world' found a personal embodiment and claimed divine honour." The world is pictured as overcome finally and forever. It is on the point of vanishing.[33] Here then again the word indifferent would seem to describe the attitude of John toward the political state. The state is something altogether outside the range of the Christian's active interest. He puts up with it, suffers as a Christian. It does not really figure in the program of God's kingdom or the certainty of its final triumph.

In some early Christian literature, like in the Revelation, the world powers are spoken of as Satanic in origin and in function. But this was not the universal view, especially among the leading apologists. The emphasis of Paul, that the state is a part of God's providential arrangement in the world, is found expressed by them. Tertullian especially gives this emphasis in his *Apologeticus*. Mention has already been made of how Augustine worked this idea into an

32. Cadoux, *Early Church and the World*, p. 100 and footnotes; p. 111.
33. Westcott, *op. cit.*, p. 268; Ramsay, *op. cit.*, pp. 302-306.

integrated theory of the relation of Church and state, after the state accepted Christianity as its religion. Naturally Augustine found it necessary to make room in his synthesis for the Christian to engage in governmental activity, including military service. Luther later tried to restore the New Testament ethic for the Christian's personal and family life, but still allowed that when carrying out the orders of the state, the individual does not violate the New Testament ethic, for in his mind it simply does not apply in the governmental sphere.

Such a double ethical standard between which the individual Christian is asked to divide his personal living is impossible for those who recognize Christ as supreme Lord of their life and hold His teachings to be valid and authoritative in every sphere of life and activity. This was the position taken by the Anabaptists, at least by the peaceful types of these people. They went back to the common attitude of the early Christian church, that of indifference to the political arrangements of society, as something worldly, temporal, secular, outside the realm in which their own circle of life and activities lay.

This has been the background of Mennonite life and thought. Today in America Church and state are legally separated into independent spheres, which they were not 400 years ago. In democratic political theory the authority of government rests ultimately with the people themselves. There are no legal disabilities which bar any citizen on religious grounds from participating in government by voting and holding public office. The question of participation in government is one that confronts nonresistant Christians today more than before. For Christians of the earliest centuries, the question seems not to have even arisen. And further, there is the essential difference between modern democratic theory and the ancient Pharaoh idea of the state as a superpower. And as for the practice of early Anabaptists, we may note that so long as they lived in countries with established State Churches, they suffered civil and political disabilities because of their faith which gave them no chance to participate as a rule.

The subject is made difficult by several factors. First of all, government or the state in the modern world is a complex affair. Large areas of governmental activity are almost purely administrative and regulative. Government, for example, carries the mail, con-

ducts educational systems, builds roads and harbors, cares for many poor and unfortunates, does research work in various fields, and carries on many other activities besides. On purely mathematical grounds, scarcely a third of our federal government's work pertains to matters that a nonresistant Christian might regard as illegitimate, the work of the Departments of War, Navy, and Justice.

Naturally nonresistant Christians cannot participate in activities of government that are unscriptural and wrong in themselves, such as war or the punishment of criminals. Since then one cannot support all that a government does, must he refuse acknowledgment of any responsibilities toward it, outside of paying taxes? Or can he discriminate and judge each activity on its own merits?

The decision on the matter of participation depends further on one's world view as a whole. The members of the Society of Friends, always strongly pacifistic, have generally been active politically, that is they have as individual citizens participated in government as far as they possibly could because they believed they should do all possible to help create a better society and a better world. And while they do not consider political activity the only or the chief means for working toward that end, they do use it as one such. Friends generally hold to a thoroughly optimistic outlook upon society and its possibilities for progress toward the Christian ideal.

In a statement issued by Friends in 1935 at Richmond, Indiana, they outline what they call valid and effective attitudes towards the State for today. On the negative side they stated that, (1) Nothing justifies disobedience to a clear conviction of what is the will of God. (2) We must try to prevent or change or repeal laws that require disobedience to the principles of Jesus. (3) We must oppose by Christian means the legal or illegal use of force as the basic principle of government, or the reliance on force as the ultimate basis of human society.

On the positive side they specify: (1) We should foster a sensitive Christian conscience to the needs and wrongs and sufferings of our fellowmen. (2) We should develop and use the constructive Christian spiritual forces of truth, reason, righteousness and love as the ground and basis of all political institutions and social relations. (3) We must not merely teach the Christian ideal but promote it by practical programs for realizing a Christian society. (4) We should

stress the function of government as the common agent of the people, co-operating in measures for the common welfare, rather than merely as a police force or the agent of military defense.[34]

In contrast with this typical Quaker political outlook, the Mennonite outlook upon society and the world has been more pessimistic, or as some might prefer to say, more realistic. Much of our emphasis has been on the separation of believers from the world, on aloofness from co-operative efforts in any line. The idea among these people has been generally that Christians should work to rescue souls out of a sinful and doomed world and prepare them for the world to come. Naturally such an outlook concerns itself little with worldly politics. Practically all the (Old) Mennonite conferences have rulings against members holding public office, outside of purely local community circles perhaps, and some conferences advise strongly against their members voting in political elections.

There is not time to consider the question whether as nonresistant people, in the light of their background and the world outlook they hold, Mennonites should take part in government by voting at general political elections. It must suffice to enumerate some reasons that are urged on both sides of the question.

The chief reasons for not voting appear to be: (1) The practice of nonconformity, or better, of separation from the world. There exists a sort of group intuition, that since it is unscriptural to be joined with unbelievers in other co-operative efforts, Christians should not acknowledge any obligation to co-operate with others in government. (2) A regard for consistency leads some to oppose voting. If men acknowledge themselves an active part of the government in peace time, they cannot well refuse to assume their share of responsibility to support the government in time of war, in a time of danger when it most needs every citizen's help. The Canadian government during the World War acted on this principle, when it disfranchised conscientious objectors to war service for the period of the war's duration. Abstinence from voting also avoids the charge sometimes made that pacifists are willing enough to take part in the quiet and pleasant part of a government's activity, but shrink from helping do the dirty work of society.[35]

---

34. *The Mind of Christ for Today*, pp. 29-33.

35. Cadoux, *Early Christian Attitude*, p. 220, answers this criticism fairly.

(3) There is the conviction too that men are not made better in a basic sense by the legislative and judicial efforts of government. The Christian's service to society is more fundamental, basic, and far-reaching, for in changing individual hearts and lives he helps prevent more crime and evil than do law-makers and judges. Hence missionary, evangelistic, and educational work should absorb the energies of Christians so fully that they have no time or interest for political affairs. (4) If nonresistant people can logically participate in an active way in government, then it should be possible for the same people to conduct a government according to their principles. But the fact is that where such attempts have been made they were failures.[36] (5) The evident political indifference of Christ and of the early Christians suggests nonparticipation as the best practice for Christians today.

On the other side, in favor of voting (that is, exclusive of electioneering and active political promotion) it is urged: (1) That simply going to the polls in a quiet way as a citizen is not necessarily political activity, but is one way of exerting a Christian influence in the community of which he is a part, a community larger, of course, than the immediate home neighborhood, but none-the-less his national community to which he owes a Christian responsibility. It is one way of doing good to all men, as Paul urged. (2) Under a democratic government like ours, where the government is by the consent of the governed, the officials can only know the wishes of the people when the people express themselves collectively in some official way. Hence in voting the Christian citizen is presumably registering his personal preference or desire (indirectly in most cases, to be sure), for the guidance of officials in deciding policies and so forth. He is not dictating how the government shall be conducted, nor is he asking to have his wish forced upon others, but is merely expressing his preference. (3) If Christian people stay away from the polls, then only the influence of non-Christians is registered in choosing officials and guiding them in determining policies. In such case Christians would have largely themselves to blame, if their liberties and privileges should be infringed upon or taken away at length.

---

36. See Hershberger, G. F., The Quaker Experiment in Politics in Colonial Pennsylvania, in *Mennonite Quarterly Review*, Vol. X, pp. 187-221 (October, 1936). For an account of the attempt by Mennonites to conduct the government of Germantown (Pennsylvania) in its early history, see Smith, C. Henry, *The Mennonite Immigration to Pennsylvania* (Norristown, Pa., 1929), pp. 110-119.

MENNONITE IMMIGRATION INTO MANITOBA

Sources and Documents, 1872, 1873

Ernst Correll

I

A remarkably complete collection of various records on the movement in the early 1870's of the Mennonites from Russia into Canada was found in the *Public Archives of Canada* in Ottawa by the present writer in the summer of 1936. It is deemed appropriate to preface the presentation of a portion of the material—otherwise largely self-explanatory—by a few observations either in addition to, or by way of correction of, previous discussions of certain phases in the emigration and immigration activities. First, however, appreciation must be expressed for the assistance rendered by Dr. James Kenney, Acting Dominion Archivist, and his staff. The careful organization and facilities of the Public Archives fortunately provide opportunities for comparative research. In the experience of the present writer at least there are few archive institutions where similar comparative studies can so conveniently be undertaken under the same roof. Especially is this true in the opportunity offered there to consult relevant printed material such as parliamentary records, local historical periodical series, etc., otherwise not easily accessible. For the student of settlement history it is especially advantageous to be able to make use of relatively ephemeral pamphlets, broadsides and other general literature advertising the great Northwest. These throw light on the mass of documents and general manuscript material in the Public Archives, such as the Papers of The Secretary of State (including Privy Council Records), as well as the material in the Papers of The Ministry of Agriculture, (Letter Books and General Correspondence Files).

II

The files consulted reveal many broad problems significant not only in Mennonite but also in the general social and economic history of Canada.

Here and there the archives reveal the concern of the Canadian Government as it is forced to face the competition of appeals made to prospective European emigrants by more experienced land agents from the United States. There is a recommendation that the measure adopted by the Federal and State Governments of the United States should be made use of in regard to the Canadian Northwest, e. g., the practice of conferring large grants on railway companies. "The Americans are adopting various means, farming colonies, settlements with fancy bye-laws and constitution complete, 'Dutch Colonies', 'New England Colonies'," writes a correspondent from Portage La Prairie, Manitoba, (Public Archives of Canada, Department of Agriculture Papers, October 1, 1872, 6964). "We have struggled under a great many disadvantages with our thoroughly alive and educated competitors . . . we had no 'Great West' to offer, no 'Prairie', no 'New State', no 'Free Grant', no 'Great Railway' running through or 'in course of construction'. But we have all these things *now* and we have them all compressed in one word *'Manitoba'* . . . destined to be the keynote to successful emigration to Canada as Ohio, Iowa and Minnesota were in turn for the U. S. A." However, the facilities offered in the United States and the more aggressive methods of immigration promotion of the Americans—reflected in several of the documents relating to Mennonite movements—diverted large numbers of prospective settlers away from the Canadian Northwest.

There does not exist at present a separate and comprehensive study of Mennonite immigration into Manitoba. As seen from the cause and origin of their emigration it is only natural that investigators have considered the movements into the United States and into Canada as one. Likewise the great Western prairie area of the North American Continent has, from a geographical point of view, determined an inclusive treatment. Works on the conspicuous epoch in American history known as the Westward Movement have logically included the entire phenomenon. It is not inconceivable, however, that the nature, type and volume of sources deposited in Ottawa may make independent studies desirable. At any rate, an intimate acquaintance with the original sources will prompt closer inquiries in several directions.

The consolidated treatments of the emigration and immigration of the Mennonites from Russia (and to a certain extent from

Prussia into the United States) have unfolded a series of problems conducive to further research. The well-known Mennonite historian Professor C. Henry Smith published in Berne, Indiana, in 1927 his *Coming of the Russian Mennonites,* subtitling it "An Episode in the Settling of the Last Frontier, 1874-1884." By this he erected a monument to the Mennonite pioneers. The value of the book springs from the intimate relationship its author had with that generation and from the resulting original touch on the subject matter. Likewise, the research results of a former German Rockefeller Fellow, Dr. Georg Leibbrandt, in two signal contributions to *The Mennonite Quarterly Review* (October 1932 and January 1933), "The Emigration of the German Mennonites from Russia to the United States and Canada, 1873-1880" and their forthcoming expansion in book-form as one of *The Studies in Anabaptist and Mennonite History* open up new possibilities in the field. Dr. Leibbrandt, a recognized scholar in the field of *Deutsche Auslandskunde* through earlier studies on German emigration and settlements abroad, must be credited with the introduction of the international diplomatic scene back of the Mennonite emigration.

III

More academic recognition is now being given to the historical rôle played and the socio-economic status assumed by the Mennonites in Canada, especially in the prairie provinces. This is all the more interesting as the sources used are usually of a statistical and technical nature. In the *McGill University Economic Studies* dealing with *National Problems of Canada* (as related to "the economics of the British Empire") John Thomas Culliton presented a study on *Assisted Emigration and Land Settlement* (Montreal 1928) with special reference to the North West. In a concise survey reference is made to the 1870's when colonizing efforts in Western Canada began to be applied in greater force. Not until 1872 did the Dominion Government adopt the homestead system, in emulation of the policy of land disposal that had been so successful in peopling the Western United States. However, the plan developed at a disappointing rate in Canada due mainly to inadequate means of transportation. To quote, in part, J. T. Culliton (pages 22 f.) : "In the decade previous to the beginning of construction on the Canadian Pacific Railway the flow of immigration . . . began, in a limited way, to filter through to Manitoba and the North West Territories,

About 1872 a considerable number of Eastern farmers emigrated from the older provinces, and settled in the Red River Valley and Southern Manitoba generally . . . . During this period few Americans crossed the border into Western Canada, but there was some immigration from Europe. *The first European immigrants of importance were the Mennonites, people of Dutch extraction.* . . . Their number was estimated at six thousand seven hundred . . ." (Italics by the present writer.).

". . . There was a contrast with French-Canadian settlement in that no *coureurs-de-bois* went ahead to open the way, no missionary priests pushed into unknown territory to establish missions. Moreover, the entry of the Mennonites was not a gradual process. The hitherto empty prairie was occupied overnight, as it were, by *thousands of Mennonites* who had arrived with their wives, children, and household goods." This quotation is taken from the study by C. A. Dawson, Professor of Sociology at McGill University, entitled *Group Settlement: Ethnic Communities in Western Canada,* Volume VII of the series *Canadian Frontiers of Settlement*, edited by W. A. Mackintosh and W. L. G. Joerg, Toronto, 1936 (page 107). Five of the "peculiar peoples" in the prairie region, the Doukhobors (1-91); Mennonites (95-171); Mormons (175-272); German Catholics (275-332); French-Canadians (335-374) are closely analyzed as to their sociological frame-work and economic structure with particular attention to the dynamic elements of change.

The "Canadian Pioneer Problems Committee" headed by Professor Mackintosh, in co-operation with Dr. Isaiah Bowman, author of the classic on *The Pioneer Fringe* (American Geographical Society, New York 1931) and assisted by the "Social Science Research Council" opened with this series the most remarkable investigation in the field. No other Mennonite area has ever been submitted to a study of this type. Of the volumes which appeared up to now this one alone covers Mennonite settlements very intensively. To be sure, the volumes issued so far were not intended primarily as an historical investigation. This one is based on case studies by field investigators (graduate students in sociology of McGill University) during the Summer of 1932. It is to be regretted that the historical part on the phenomena of recurrent migration and on Mennonite origins is based on very few and secondary sources. As a result

conclusions are not always based on reliable information and certain ones would probably be difficult to prove.

Unwarranted, for instance, is the following statement by Professor Dawson (page 102): "The land on the Canadian side did not impress (the Mennonite delegates) as favourably as that further South, but the Canadian government was willing to concede all their demands for sectarian freedom, while no similar concessions could be obtained from the government of the United States. This meant a certain selection of migrants to each of the two countries. Those who placed fertile land above complete sectarian freedom went to the United States, while those who insisted upon religious liberty at any price came to Canada." Consultation of the original sources and documents leads to a different explanation. The facts in the matter were, briefly, as follows: the Federal Government of the United States could not, constitutionally, grant universal (national) exemption from military service or jury duty, or make arrangements for public school control since these were all subjects within the jurisdiction of the states. However, the latter freely and legally granted freedom for conscientious objectors. Like the Canadian government the American states also referred to exemptions granted to similar groups in the past. (Compare my report on "President Grant and the Mennonite Immigration from Russia" and the documentary evidence presented there, in *Mennonite Quarterly Review,* July, 1935, with additional references on the problem.) Moreover the Mennonite appraisal of the quality of Manitoba land was perhaps as high as the Mennonite appraisal of land in the Western States as can be seen from the original documents. Among the Mennonite communities who preferred a domicile in the United States were some of the most ardent of all defenders of conscientious objection to military service and other obligations contrary to their principles, such as the Hutterians who preferred the Dakotas as well as the group of strictly "defenseless" Prussian Mennonites who with their co-religionists from Russia settled in Nebraska and Kansas. There is indeed no justification for an explanation of the separation of the Mennonites of Russia in the above sense. Various other reasons led to it.—Aside from discrepancies of this kind, and whether one agrees with some of the general conclusions or not, the contributions made by Professor Dawson's comparative analysis of peculiarities and modes of assimilation will be invaluable.

The total of German-ethnic customs and Mennonite "ways of life" and their perspective in the Canadian commonwealth are more positively appraised in Robert England's study on *The Colonization of Western Canada,* London and Toronto 1936. The approach in this study is different than that used in the Mackintosh-Joerg series. The author has been associated with the Community Progress Competitions in Continental European settlements in Western Canada under the auspices of the Canadian National Railways. Much of this experience is recorded in this book most of which was completed in 1933. Although its subtitle limits the discussion to "Contemporary Land Settlement," beginning in 1896, the earlier period is rather carefully summarized. Reliable historical information as regards the "Rooted Group Communities" (Chapter III, pages 201-276) is in evidence. Mr. England does not philosophize about "cultural islands" and is not concerned with the processes by which those "peculiar" homogeneous bodies emancipate from original patterns, turn heterogeneous and submit to "Canadianization." He points to the astonishing resilience of their economy when fluctuating world wheat markets cause general economic distress. He comments on the religio-ethical principles functioning behind Mennonite statistics (pages 245-247). The family set-up encouraged by religious creed and household economies so characteristically efficacious in these groups are referred to as "shock absorbers" of the modern business civilization. ". . . the depression has taught us the value of many communities that retained the traditional attitude to the family. German, Mennonite, Ukrainian rural communities in particular have been characterized by little unemployment, small expenditures on public relief, reasonably well collected taxes, family responsibility, thrift, and industry, and they have provided a sheet anchor for Western Canada in a period when ordinary economic enterprise has proved profitless. . ." (page 305). Their social and economic virtues strengthened by religious cohesion, and their unity in productive efforts directed toward self-sufficiency, make these groups virtually "depression proof." It must be realized of course that this relatively "protected economic behavior" is primarily due to a rural existence and would hardly function successfully in an urban environment.

IV

A study of the Canadian efforts directed toward securing a portion of the prospective Mennonite emigrants from Russia to Mani-

toba should focus attention on the participation of the Ontario German-Swiss Mennonite and other German communities from Waterloo County. Noteworthy is the careful record kept in Ottawa of their co-operation in immigration, sheltering and settlement work even before the Ontario Mennonites were drawn in more definitely as "bounden parties" to the Canadian Government Loan advanced to Manitoban pioneer settlers in 1875. Foremost, from the very beginning, was Jacob Yost Shantz (1822-1909). Without his energetic devotion the Manitoba settlement of ever growing numbers of families and congregations of Mennonites could not have progressed as it did. In the files of the Canadian government agencies are found, written in a characteristic hand, a large number of, usually brief, communications by him. For decades, J. Y. Shantz acted as spokesman of the Ontario Brethren as well as trusted negotiator for the Mennonites from Russia while in the United States John Fretz Funk (1835-1930) rose to similar trusted leadership among the American German-Swiss Mennonites and the immigrants from Russia and Prussia. Although as founder and editor of Mennonite periodicals with headquarters in Elkhart, Indiana, he had become widely known, his biographers fail to emphasize Funk's work for the welfare of the Brethren from abroad. A certain amount of documentary evidence of it centralized in the "Mennonite Board of Guardians" of which he was treasurer is extant in the "John Funk Collection" of the *Mennonite Historical Society of Goshen College.* This collection also contains record of the services rendered by J. Y. Shantz.

Attention is further directed to L. J. Burkholder's *Brief History of the Mennonites in Ontario,* Markham, Ont. 1935, pages 174 f, for a summary relative to assistance given by native Ontario Mennonites, who provided shelters in their homes in Waterloo, The Twenty, and Markham. Burkholder refers (page 325) to the Provincial *Archives* in Toronto (Parliament Buildings) where miscellaneous letters in the "Mennonite Box", group L, contain items designated as "1874(14) (L) Jacob Y. Shantz *re* Funds for Russian Relief". The same collection (labelled "Group R Records") includes "data *re* Russian Immigration" consisting of copies from documents of Philip Wismer (1810-1897), one of the outstanding members of the Ontario Aid Committee. The "John Funk Collection" also contains Wismer material.

Jacob Y. Shantz acted as *spiritus rector* of the *"Verwaltungs-*

Committee der Mennoniten-Gemeinde von Ontario," (in letters to the Department of Agriculture, Ottawa, e. g., *ibid.* 13777, he calls it "Committee of Management of Mennonites of Ontario"). He also signs as Secretary-Treasurer of the Committee of Ontario Mennonites composed of Elias Schneider, J. Y. Shantz, John Gascho, Samuel Reesor, John Koch, and Philip Wismer. Unique, indeed, is that most detailed record which the Ottawa Government agencies kept of every move he made, as well as of the information (frequently by telegraph) on transport requirements and the care needed by the immigrants. Usually he was present and exercised semi-official authority on all parties involved. A well-knit history could be woven around Shantz's remarkable contribution, his evidently efficient and esteemed help in solving a hard task to the satisfaction of all concerned. Dr. H. M. Bowman, in a biographical sketch, "Jacob Y. Shantz, Pioneer of Russian Mennonite Immigration to Manitoba" (*Twelfth Annual Report of the Waterloo Historical Society,* 1924, pp. 85-100), was apparently uninformed of the Ottawa sources. The Archives also reveal Shantz's occupations. He was not only a farmer, but was also known as a saw miller, builder and contractor and had started an industrial venture in a felt boot and shoe factory. The letterhead he uses on November 19, 1874 (Department of Agriculture, General Correspondence, 11971) identifies him merely as a "Dealer in Lumber and Shingles," while on August 26, 1876 (*ibid.* 17151) the letterhead reads: "Dominion Button Works. Jacob Y. Shantz. Manufacturer of Vegetable Ivory Buttons." The latter, according to Dr. Bowman, became his chief and most permanent business.

Apparently the Government did not approach J. Y. Shantz for assistance in its immigration promotion before October, 1872. This was several months after negotiations were under way between British and Mennonite authorities and the Canadian Government. In the meantime also, the latter had despatched to South Russia a special Emigration Agent in the person of another Ontario German, William Hespeler (1830-1921). A Lutheran, born in Baden-Baden, Germany, trained in the Polytechnic Institute in Karlsruhe, he emigrated in 1850 to Preston, Waterloo County, where he joined his brother in business. Subsequent to the successful work with the Mennonites he became Commissioner of Immigration and Agriculture in Winnipeg, 1873-1883, and later acted as Consul of the German

Empire for Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, 1883-1909. *The Story of Manitoba,* 1913, III, has data on Hespeler's achievements suggestive of a worthwhile biography. Additional material, dealing largely with Mennonite matters, could be gleaned from the Archives in Ottawa. Jacob E. Klotz, Immigration Agent to Germany (appointed January 17, 1872, Letter Book No. 5, p. 143) was another Ontario German active in the work. On February 11, 1874 (*ibid.* No. 8, p. 56) he was directed to bestow particular attention to embarkation of Mennonites sailing from Hamburg to Canada, and his reports became most informative. The *Waterloo Historical Society Museum* in Kitchener is likely to have among its sundry Klotz historical papers some that relate to Mennonite immigration in which his father, a Preston, Ontario, pioneer, also took an active interest. (Otto Klotz to Minister of Agriculture, November 2, 1874, 11901; *Waterloo Historical Society Reports,* 1913-1918, 2nd Annual Rep., p. 50; 12th Annual Rep., 1924, p. 50.)

Important news on prospective Mennonite emigration was forwarded by Hespeler in the late summer and fall of 1872. Proposed or actual trips of representatives from Russia to America were rumored. Canadian officials in Ottawa even suspicioned that H. M.'s Consul in Berdiansk, James Zohrab (not "Schrab" as misspelled by previous authors) was working in the interests of the United States at the time a Mennonite Deputation was induced to visit Nebraska. (Department of Agriculture to Hespeler, *ibid.* September 17, 1872, Letter Book No. 6, pages 150-152.)

It was under such circumstances that the Department became anxious to contact certain "Mennonite Delegates from Russia" who in reality were merely private Mennonite visitors from Russia with no mandate or power of attorney to decide on settlement plans. Some of them had returned home but Bernhard Warkentin (from near Berdiansk) was finally located by Shantz on behalf of the Canadian government. The telegraphic exchanges in this search are stated herewith as they initiated Jacob Y. Shantz into his great service. On October 12, 1872 (Letter Book, No. 6, p. 178) John Lowe, Secretary to the Department of Agriculture, wired a certain John Shantz—("lives 14 miles from Berlin, Ontario")—: "Please telegraph me if Mennonite Delegates from Russia have left this Continent. Would you come to Ottawa to consult on Mennonite Immigration—Government paying your expenses." John replied October

14 (*ibid.* General Correspondence 6972) that to his knowledge three had left the Continent and one was still in the States and suggested that *Jacob Y. Shantz* and *Joseph E. Snyder* should be consulted as he could not attend, whereupon the Secretary (*ibid.* Letter Book, No. 6, P. 180) on the same day asked both John and Jacob Y. Shantz to telegraph Mennonite Delegate in States to come to Ottawa. J. Y. Shantz—same day, *ibid.* 6978—announced his expected arrival in Ottawa; on October 17—*ibid.* 7005—that he had located the Russian delegate in Elkhart, Indiana; on October 18—*ibid.* 7024—that he expected the delegate at his place and that he would be in Ottawa with him shortly.

The next information available in relation to the prospects of immigration are two letters of the same date (October 31, 1872, *ibid.* Letter Book, No. 6, pages 211-212) requesting officers in Manitoba, one of them the Dominion Crown Land Agent at Fort Garry (Winnipeg), to afford all information and facilities to a "delegation of Mennonites from Southern Russia . . . about visiting Manitoba with a view to ascertain its capabilities as a field for a large Mennonite Immigration" and to put the delegation in touch with William Wagner, the Provincial Land Surveyor, a native of Prussia.

The Department of Agriculture received an application dated Berlin, Ontario, October 31, 1872 (*ibid.* 7151), from Henry Bachmann, "a Mennonite from Germany," who had lived in Ontario for many years and decided to settle with his friends in Manitoba, referring to correspondence with friends and relations in Bavaria and Baden, where Mennonites were very numerous and, in his opinion, most willing to emigrate to America on account of the new Military Laws in the German Empire, intolerable to their religious faith. He would like "to travel with J. Y. Shantz and the Russian just out now up to Manitoba. Mr. Shantz intends to start next week and would be very glad to have me along as spokesman and a companion." Bachmann offered to go to Germany afterward to bring out his friends and "assist in increasing the colony." Nothing further could be learned of these propositions. It is known, however, that (in contrast to the participation of the Eastern Mennonites of the United States in the Western settlement of Mennonites from Russia) Mennonites of Ontario did not take part in the Manitoba settlement at the time. (Migration of Ontario Mennonites to the

Canadian West did not take place before 1891, see L. J. Burkholder, *ibid.,* page 130.)

On November 4, 1872, J. Y. Shantz (*ibid.* 7152) telegraphed the Department of Agriculture that he expected to leave for the Manitoba journey the next day. After delay in Minnesota and Dakota because of snow storms Shantz and Warkentin arrived in Winnipeg on Sunday, November 19, 1872. (Communication by the Dominion Crown Land Agent to Department of Agriculture, *ibid.* 7310). In a letter dated Winnipeg November 28, 1872 (*ibid.* 7388) Shantz relates the first favorable impression made by this preliminary investigation of Manitoba settlement opportunities. Unfortunately the letter by Warkentin to which he refers in the same letter could not be found.

Pertinent is J. Y. Shantz's query in this letter addressed to the Minister as to whether he should make a report in German. "If so write to Berlin. Germans are scattered all through the Western States . . . from all parts of Germany . . . have no knowledge of the Northwest . . ." Then he lists some of the common prejudices in the States, refutes these and explains the "preference we have over the Western States" in the fact that good land extends so much farther and is so larger so we have also this advantage of immigration so much more and longer." Moreover, the settler would be able to purchase land wherever he wished while in the States railway company grants imposed certain limitations and demanded higher prices.

There was some eagerness on the part of the Canadian officials to have the findings of Shantz and Warkentin prepared "with as much detail as possible, in a form for publication." (Secretary, Department of Agriculture to Shantz, January 8, 1873, Letter Book, No. 6, page 270). Shantz undoubtedly took advantage of earlier publications of this sort such as *The German in Canada,* a magazine for the promotion of German Immigration to Canada, Hamilton, Ontario, the first issue of which apparently came off the press in November, 1871. (The Department of Agriculture Correspondence contains frequent communications with its editor and publisher C. Mack.) A similar outside source was the German-born William Wagner, the Manitoban Land Surveyor who had done much to publicize the North West. Shantz ordered copies of a German pamphlet issued by Wagner for Warkentin to send to Russia. (De-

partment of Agriculture, January 13, 1873, 7512). The letter of February 28 addressed to the Minister of Agriculture, later reprinted in the *Narrative,* possibly accompanied a first draft of it. On May 28, 1873 (to the Department, 8331) Shantz refers to his completed report stating the bid of a Berlin, Ontario, printer for its translation and printing in English. As early as July 3, 1873 (*ibid.* Letter Book No. 7, pages 148-149) the Department advised a new emigration agent about to leave for Germany and South Russia of a "paper published by the German Society of Montreal, principally based on reports of Mr. Wagner and the pamphlet of Mr. Shantz." Continued Correspondence indicates the ever growing significance and use of the *Narrative of a Journey to Manitoba* by J. Y. Shantz to which was added an abstract of the Dominion Land Act, and an extract from the government pamphlet on Manitoba. (See also Magdalen Casey, *Catalogue of Pamphlets in the Public Archives of Canada,* Ottawa 1931). Over a protracted period of promotion work the Shantz *Narrative* was reproduced in all sorts of editions running to several hundreds of thousands. Earlier it had been reprinted in *The German in Canada,* the October 28, 1873 issue, if our source is correct, and before then most likely in *Der Deutsche in Canada.* (Those especially interested should make a final check in collections of the Ontario and Waterloo Historical Societies.) During the first year of its appearance the pamphlet was also published in French: *Relation d'un Voyage à Manitoba par J. Y. Schantz,* Ottawa, Imprimé par Robertson, Roger et Cie. On August 18, 1873 (*ibid,* Letter Book No. 7, p. 194) the Department inquired whether Shantz wished to make additions from information on his recent journey to Manitoba (where he and Hespeler escorted the delegation of Mennonites and Hutterites from Russia). But Shantz replied (*ibid.* General Correspondence, 8964) he "could scarcely make an addition to the pamphlet worthwhile mentioning as I found the country . . . as described and the crops all in good healthy growth."

There was hardly an official or semi-official publication on Manitoba colonization prospects which did not from that time on over a long period carry at least a major portion of the original *Narrative.* They usually appeared under a general title such as: *Province of Manitoba. Information for Intending Immigrants, Department of Agriculture,* Ottawa, 1874. Other official communications, such as

the *Report of the Minister of Agriculture* for 1877, include from the pen of Shantz "progress reports." Much attention is given to early Manitoban Mennonite achievements, and recommendations from Shantz are found in the rich *Letters by James Trow, M. P.* (Chairman of Immigration and Colonization Committee) dealing with *Manitoba and North West Territories,* Ottawa 1878. Similar succinct chapters in a great development history can be read from the Annual Reports of the Winnipeg Agent (Hespeler), from Reports on Colonization in Manitoba (J. W. Down, Toronto), from Reports of the Dufferin Immigration Agent (J. E. Têtu), from Hearings of the Select Committee on Immigration and Colonization. All of these documents are either submitted to and/or published by the Dominion Minister of Agriculture or found in *Sessional Papers.*

Backed by the Ontario brethren as bondsmen Jacob Y. Shantz' leadership was again essential in negotiations which caused favorable legislation whereby the Canadian Parliament in 1875 sanctioned a loan of $100,000 "to aid members of the Mennonite community in settling in the Province of Manitoba" (38 Victoria Chap. 3) frequently commented upon as a unique occurrence. (See, e. g., C. Stanley Johnson, *History of Emigration from the United Kingdom to North America,* 1763-1912, London School of Economics Studies, 1913, pages 246f). Indeed even the amount granted seems to be considerable when compared to the subsidy of nearly the same size which the Manitoban government required from the Dominion to defray running public expenses. (*Letters by James Trow,* M. P., page 77). The Ottawa archives furnish in the Department of Agriculture Papers not only precise details on the utilization of that loan but similar clear records could be collected from Department of Justice, Receiver General, and other Papers, showing over more than one and a half decades the mortgaging and debt services which in their smooth functioning won popular praise for the "Mennonite Society of Ontario" and for the ultimate debtors and beneficiaries in the townships developing in frontier Manitoba. Combined with complementary documents and records of the Ontario Mennonite aid organization available in the Goshen College Historical Society the way is open to make possible new approaches to the study.

Students of the archival records of one of the most memorable nineteenth century immigration movements need not feel bewildered by the immense opportunities for general as well as specific research

inquiries. Once more attention may be called to a summary testimony to the concrete accomplishments of the Mennonite group under discussion. Reference is made to the judgment of eminent specialists: Dr. R. W. Murchie, formerly Professor of Rural Economics and Sociology, Manitoba Agricultural College, Dr. Wm. Allen, Professor of Farm Management, University of Saskatchewan and Mr. J. F. Booth, Commissioner of Agricultural Economics, Dominion Department of Agriculture, responsible for the *Canadian Frontiers of Settlement Series,* Volume V, dealing with *Agricultural Progress on the Prairie Frontier* (Toronto 1936). In the chapter on agricultural developments on the Canadian Prairies they state, page 7:

"To the Mennonite settlers belongs the distinction of having been the first to demonstrate that agriculture could be successfully followed on the highland of the prairies, that wheat growing and general farming were both possible, and that a good living was obtainable on the open plain."

Few, indeed, are such numerically insignificant groups in human history whose achievements could thus be epitomized. And smaller yet is the number of independent communities who testify to the Christian spirit as their most noble tradition even through socio-economic principles characteristically their own. May the record of their deeds grow in abundance and may there be many who, in earnest study, explore it for historiographic or literary ends. The glorious record of weary days will survive superficial descriptions or haphazard sociological speculations. What we cherish is in full detail the story of the so-called Russian branch of the Mennonite frontier people—mostly of Frisian origin—who, as early as the middle of the sixteenth century, left marks of their distinguished civilization in the erstwhile swampy districts of Poland and Eastern Germany; at the close of the eighteenth century in the steppes of Southern Russia; and finally in the untilled plains of North and South America.

Sources and Documents

Note: Some of the following documents have been quoted in part in previous publications especially those of C. Henry Smith and Georg Leibbrandt. Their authority among others was: *Wichtige Dokumente betreffs der Wehrfreiheit der Mennoniten in Canada.* Im Selbstverlage der Canadischen Mennonitengemeinden. Gretna, Manitoba, 1917. In addition Dr. Leibbrandt used the appendices of a manuscript thesis by Mr. Willows of the University of Manitoba. See Leibbrandt, *op. cit.,* page 206.—The fol-

lowing are the correct versions taken from the records in *The Public Archives of Canada.*

The other documents presented herewith have not previously been published.

Petition of Leonhard Sudermann, Elder in the Molotschna Colony, to the British Consul Zohrab at Berdiansk. January 3/15, 1872. (Official Translation).

Source:

Public Archives of Canada, Secretary of State Papers, 1872, Series G.

"You are aware that by the introduction of the new law of 4 (16) June, 1871, the so-called Mennonites residing in about a hundred villages, also in various estates and localities round about as well as we who are established in this town, are to be deprived of the right of conscientiously abstaining from the use of arms, which has hitherto been enjoyed, and are to be employed in military service for the army. But all who will not or can not submit to these new arrangements are allowed to emigrate freely within ten years. As, unless His Majesty the Emperor alters this, our present distressed condition, and graciously complies with our petitions for a special law, thoroughly to secure for the future the liberties which we have hitherto enjoyed, we shall soon have to consider the important question of life for us and our children and seek and secure in the best possible way a new home. In making the choice America is of importance to us, and the inclination may be partly for Canada and partly for the United States. We therefore apply to you, Honorable Sir, with the respectful request, that you will kindly obtain information for us on the following questions:

1. Might our community, which like the Society of Friends (Quakers) decidedly refuses on principles found in the Word of God to take any part direct or indirect in military service, obtain from Her Majesty the Queen and the government of Canada a special legal position, like that of the Society of Friends, that is, entire exemption from all military service in reach of the law of Defense? We are not unaware that under the Government of Her Majesty the Queen, no one can be forced to serve as a soldier, nevertheless the special concession, the subject of this request, is of the greatest importance to us;

2. Whether the emigrants to Canada might hope for a grant of land there or for the cheap purchase of the same, also in case of necessity for an advance from the Government? For, although we are now here for the most part in good circumstances for our position, yet a general emigration must occasion a considerable average loss, especially as the land is looked upon as crown property, and thus the practical and often expensive dwelling houses become almost of no value, and our present fraternal position requires that the poor also should be enabled to emigrate;

3. Whether both for special requests as also for the arrangement of regulations, a deputation would be advisable to the Government of Her Majesty the Queen in London and also to Canada and what kind of credentials would be necessary for this purpose.

We, the undersigned, some of whom are personally known to you, Honorable Sir, confidently hope that you, who know our circumstances and also the industrial services of the Mennonites in this country, will interest yourself for us in our present oppressed position and recommend us to the government of Her Majesty."

Petition of P. Lohrenz and others to Consul Zohrab. January 13, 1872. (Official Translation).

Source:

Ibid.

Encouraged by the step taken by our co-religionists of Berdiansk to whom you have already shown your sympathy in regard to their religious embarrassments in this town by receiving their requests expressed in their letter of the beginning of January, we the undersigned join in each of the three questions set forth in their petition and fully agree with them.

If we also apply to you, Hon. Sir, with confidence, it is with the wish that you would have the goodness to recommend our affair specially to H. M. Government, so that we may receive as soon as possible an answer as kind as definite.

Although very few of our community sign the present request, we may reckon with certainty that on a favourable answer to our questions many more will join in the matter with interest, if our petition to the high Government here, sent in a year ago, should not have the desired result.

A pamphlet in the German language on Minnesota, communicated to us a short time ago, gives desirable local information about that State; we should be very glad to have something similar about Canada, and if we could get it we should be very much obliged to you.

Consul Zohrab to Earl Granville, British Foreign Secretary. Berdiansk, February 3, 1872.

Source:

Ibid.

In 1800, the Menonites were invited by the Russian Government to proceed to New Russia and establish Colonies. Members accepted the invitation and from the beginning of this century up to 1870 there was a considerable yearly immigration. To each family on entering was given sixty-five dessatines, (175 acres) of land free of charge. The Government decreed that the Immigrants were not to be interfered with by the Russian Authorities in any way, that each Colony was to be self-governing; that the Prussian nationality was to be retained; that all communication between the Government and Colonies was to be carried on through a representative of the Colonies to reside in Odessa, that the Colonies were to be exempted for ever from every kind of Military Service and that they were to be perfectly free in the exercise of their religion and in the Government and control of their schools.

The Russian Government adhered to these conditions up to the 4/16 July 1870, when by an Imperial Ukase it was decreed that the Agency at Odessa should be abolished, the direction of the German schools be assumed by the Russian Authorities, the study of the Russian language to be made compulsory and that all colonists after a certain date were to submit to Military service and to the conscription.

A period of ten years is granted by this Ukase to the Germans, dating from its issue, to elect whether they submit to its conditions or quit the Country.

On the publication of the Ukase, a deputation from the Menonites proceeded to St. Petersburg to try and get some changes made in their favour. The deputation was kindly received by Count Haydn and other members of the Military Commission and an assurance was given that though the law would not be altered, their religious opinions would be respected and some concessions made in their favour, and that when their position was taken into consideration, they would be invited to send deputies to explain what they required. Well satisfied with this assurance the deputation returned to Berdiansk.

A year, however, passed without any intimation from the Government being received, the Menonites became apprehensive and instituted inquiries at the Capital. They were informed that not only would no steps be taken to mitigate the laws in their favor, but that every arrangement had been completed to carry out the law in its original form, and the signature of the Emperor alone was wanting to make everything complete.

That part of the Ukase which makes Military service obligatory becomes law in 1873, while the clause which makes the conscription compulsory on all classes will come into force in 1881.

Persuaded that there is no remedy for them, the Menonites are now most anxious to take advantage of the clause which permits them to leave the Country between this and 1880, and as their members are considerable, they say there is no time to be lost if the desire is to be realized, considering that the emigration of thousands of families has to be organized.

In selecting Canada as their future home they have been guided by the favorable account they have received of the fertility and salubrity and by its being a British possession.

Their object in addressing me the letter I enclose is to obtain every possible information regarding Canada; on what condition they will be permitted to emigrate thither, and what engagements they will have to fulfil in regard to the Government.

It is very probable that if your Lordship considers it necessary to afford them the information they require, and they regard it as favorable, that during 1873 two or three thousand Menonite families will quit this Country and they will be speedily followed by thousands of others, and from what I have been able to learn, I doubt not the departure of the Menonites would be rapidly followed by that of Germans of other denominations who are now, I am informed, watching the course pursued by the Menonites with the object of following it if successful.

The population of the Menonite Colonies in this part of Russia is estimated at from 60,000 to 80,000 souls.

The departure of the Germans will, undoubtedly, be a serious loss to the Country for they are not only much greater proficients in agriculture than the native population, and consequently produce heavier crops and finer qualities but they are very hard working and therefore, in proportion to each man, they bring a much larger quantity of land under cultivation and thus increase the produce of the Country. They employ large numbers of Russian peasants as farm laborers and their villages are patterns of cleanliness and good order.

Seven years residence in this Country has enabled me to acquire a good knowledge of them and I am personally acquainted with many of their elders. I feel no hesitation therefore, in saying that these Germans would prove a valuable acquisition to any Country they may select for their future home. If they find difficulty in proceeding to Canada they will seek refuge in the United States to which country their attention has been already directed, but as I have already stated their first choice falls on British soil, and though their determination to quit this Country is fixed, yet from what I can learn, they will do so with regret if they have to leave for any country other than Canada.

Should your Lordship forward me any printed details for their information I would suggest that all such information be in German.

I would also respectfully beg an immediate acknowledgement of this despatch so that I may be assured that it has safely reached.

Consul Zohrab to Cornelius Jansen. Berdiansk, March 5, 1872.

Source:

Public Archives of Canada, Department of Agriculture, General Correspondence, 7140.

I am directed by Earl Granville, H. B. M. Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, to inform you that the points on which you require information regarding Emigration to Canada, as set forth in the letter addressed to me by the elders of the Menonits on the 3/15th January last, are under the consideration of H. B. M. Government.

I beg of you to make this known to the Gentlemen who signed the letter of the 3/15th of January.

Lord Kimberley, Secretary of Colonial Office, to Lord Lisgar, Governor General of Canada. March 7, 1872.

Source:

Public Archives of Canada, Secretary of State Papers, 1872, Series G.

I have the honor to transmit to your Lordship a copy of a letter from the Foreign Office with a despatch from Her Majesty's Consul at Berdiansk enclosing letters, of which translations are annexed, from German Mennonites established in Russia, enquiring whether if they emigrated to Canada they would be allowed certain privileges there as to exemption from Military Service.

I have to request that you will bring these papers under the consideration of your Ministers, and that you will report to me the views which they may entertain with regard to this application.

Consul Zohrab to Earl Granville. Berdiansk, March 15, 1872. No. 5.

Source:
Ibid. Department of Agriculture, General Correspondence, 7140.

In obedience to your Lordship's instructions contained in Lord Enfield's despatch, No. 2, of the 22nd February, I informed the Chiefs of the Menonites here that the points on which they requested information were under the consideration of Her Majesty's Government.

I beg to enclose a copy of my despatch.

They appeared grateful for the answer I had to deliver and expressed their thanks very warmly.

I have now to report that a deputation consisting of six representatives of the Mennonites, proceeded to St. Petersburgh towards the end of February, to try to obtain some definite promise from the Government. After two unsuccessful attempts to obtain an interview with one of the Ministers, they were at last received by M. Gerngross who assured them that, for the present, nothing could be done for them, as the question of the conscription would not be definitely settled till September, when they might petition the Grand Duke Constantine or the Emperor, and till then, any action on their part would be quite useless. His Excellency added that he was well aware that the Emigration to Canada was now actively agitated amongst the Menonites.

In February, the Germans were lead to believe that the new law as regards Military Service, would not be put in force till 1880, but they are now informed that it will be so next year, or at the latest in 1874, and though they will still be free to leave the Country, the men who may have been already enrolled will have to pay roubles 860 (about £115) to obtain their release.

. . . . .

The idea of emigrating to Canada does not appear to be confined to the Menonites in this country, but is likewise entertained by those in Prussia, and they are in communication with the chiefs here. They are however, limited in number.

Consul Zohrab to Earl Granville. Berdiansk, March 25, 1872. No. 6.

Source:
Ibid.

I have the honor to acknowledge Lord Tenterden's despatch No. 3 of the 12th March, informing me by your Lordship's direction, that the Governor General of Canada has been requested to favour H. M. Govt. with his views in regard to the desire of the German Menonites of this district, to emigrate to Canada.

Mr. Jansen, one of their leading men was with me this morning, and I communicated to him the substance of the despatch. He thanked me for the attention H. M. Government was giving to their wishes, and added that while the desire to quit a country in which their position had been so changed, was general among the Germans, still the people generally could not be persuaded that the Emperor would put in force

the new laws against them, and they believed that at the last the Government would give way and release them.

The Chiefs are fully persuaded that such a course will not and cannot be pursued by the Government, and that no changes in their favour will be made. Meetings are constantly held to discuss the matter, when the leaders expose the dangers of hesitation, but as they have as yet no substantial proofs that the Government will not give way, and no offers or basis on which to rest their arguments of the advantages of emigrating to Canada, they are unable to bring their assurances to conviction, but they are persuaded that when they are fully informed as to the terms on which they will be admitted to colonize in Canada, and when the Russian Government give, as they must eventually do, a refusal to their prayers for a continuation of their privileges, the determination to leave will be unanimous, and will be acted on.

It is remarkable that though there is much hesitation at present, and the leaders feel even discouraged, yet whenever they cease to canvass the matter, they are immediately begged by the different villages not to cease their labours.

It is natural that those interested should tremble at the prospect before them, and hesitate to come to a final decision, and try to remain where they are, and hope that their wishes will be granted. To leave long established homes, to give up positions of prosperity; to sacrifice their properties for conscience sake, are sore trials, and must demand great moral determination.

That the Germans will exhibit this force of character when the hour for deciding arrives I do not doubt.

Lord A. Loftus, British Ambassador to Russia, to Earl Granville.
St. Petersburgh, April 3, 1872.

Source:

Ibid.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Lordship's despatch No. 1 Consular, of the 12th ultimo, enclosing a despatch from H. M.'s Consul at Berdiansk, reporting the wish of certain members of the German Mennonite Colony in that district to emigrate to Canada.

As this question might, unless duly and properly explained, produce some sensitiveness on the part of the Imperial Government and be misinterpreted, I thought it judicious to mention the subject at once to Prince Gortchacoff.

I may also observe to your Lordship that the penalties imposed by Russian law on emigrants, and on those who further emigration, without the previous consent of the Imperial Government are very severe.

I consequently informed Prince Gortchacoff that certain German colonists in Southern Russia had signified a wish to emigrate to Canada and had requested information as to the terms on which they would be received by the Government of Canada.

I stated to His Highness that although I had no instructions from your Lordship on the subject, there were two courses to be taken before any answer could be given to the applicants.

The first was as regarded the consent of the Canadian Government

to receive these Emigrants, and the second was with regard to the assent of the Imperial Government to their emigration.

Prince Gortchacoff stated that a similar question had been lately addressed to him by the Turkish Ambassador with regard to certain Bulgarians established in Bessarabia, who had applied to the Turkish Government for permission to return to Bulgaria.

His Highness said that no objection would be raised by the Imperial Government to the emigration of these colonists.

They were free to go in accordance with the agreements entered into on their first arrival, subject to their fulfilling all obligations in accordance with the laws.

On referring to the new Military system imposing obligatory service on all Russian subjects without exception, which is the principal cause of these Colonists emigrating from Russia, Prince Gortchacoff observed that he had voted in the Council of the Empire against the withdrawal of the privileges, and the exemption from Military service formerly granted to these Colonists, on the principle that the promises made by the Sovereign of the day should be held as sacred.

In this opinion he stated that the Emperor had participated, but the great majority of the Council had voted in a contrary sense.

I am informed by the American Charge d'Affaires that he has received a similar application from the American Consul at Berdiansk, stating that the German Colonists were desirous of emigrating to the United States, and enquiring on what condition they would be received as colonists. M. Scuyler has referred this question to his Government before making any reply. He is of opinion however that being known to be a thrifty, hard working, and well ordered population, they will be welcomed in the United States, and that they may be turned to useful account in those parts of the United States where planting is required, in which they are said to be proficient.

I beg leave to return to your Lordship herewith the original despatch from Her Majesty's Consul at Berdiansk, and its enclosures; which were transmitted to me in your Lordship's despatch No. 1, marked Consular, of the 12th ultimo.

Timothy C. Smith, U. S. Consul, to Sudermann, Hiebert, Plenner, Jansen and other Mennonites. Berdiansk, Odessa, April 10, 1872.

Source:

Public Archives of Canada, General Correspondence, No. 7140.

Referring to my letter of the 20th of March, in reply to yours of the 22/3 February, I now have the pleasure to communicate the reply from the Embassy at St. Petersburg to the questions proposed.

1st. Compulsory Military Service does not exist in the U. S.

2nd. By the Homestead laws of the U. S. every actual settler, who has declared his intention of becoming a citizen, has a right to receive 165 acres of land. Besides this, land can always be purchased from the Govt. or from railway companies at very cheap rates. The standard Govt. price is one dollar and one quarter per acre. The Northern Pacific

Railway (among others) offers land at long credit and cheap rates, and furnishes work for emigrants.
3rd. It would do no harm and might be productive of great advantage to send a small deputation to America to see what could be done and to select a site for colony.

Report to the Committee of the Canadian Privy Council, approved by the Governor-General, April 26, 1872.

Source:

Public Archives of Canada, Department of Agriculture Papers, General Correspondence, 5980; also 5951 1/2. (Privy Council 827B).

The Committee of Council have had under consideration a Despatch No. 51 of the 7th March, 1872 from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies transmitting Copy of a Letter from the Foreign Office (22nd February 1872) with a Despatch from Her Majesty's Consul at Berdiansk enclosing Letters from German Mennonites established in Russia enquiring whether if they emigrate to Canada they would be allowed certain privileges there as to exemption from Military Service.

This Despatch having been referred to the Hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence, that Officer reports that the body of Religionists known as Menonites, is by Statute put on the same footing as Quakers and he calls attention to the 17th Section of the "Act respecting the Militia and Defence of the Dominion of Canada" (31st Vic. Cap. 40) by which it is enacted that "any person bearing a Certificate from the Society of Menonists" shall be "exempt from Military Service when balloted in time of peace or war, upon such conditions and such regulations as the Governor-in-Council may, from time to time prescribe."

The said Despatch and enclosures having been also referred to the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture for report with respect to the other matters therein alluded to the Minister recommends that the applicants be informed that a free grant of 160 acres of best land in the possession of the Dominion in the Province of Manitoba, or in other parts of the North West Territory during the years 1872 and 1873 will be made to any person among them, or to as many persons as may apply over the age of 21 years, upon the condition of settlement, and further that, in the other Provinces of the Dominion either free grants of land may be obtained or purchases made on easy terms and at merely nominal prices. The settlers may obtain contiguous lots of land, so as to enable them to form their own communities.

That as relates to their enquiry touching a possible application for aid he respectfully recommends that they be informed, it is not the policy of the Dominion Government to grant aid to any settlers in Canada.

That as relates to the information with which they ask to be furnished he recommends that a supply of the several publications of the Provinces and of the Department of Agriculture, containing information for intending Emigrants, be sent to them—and further that in view of the proposed large movement of population, that they should be invited to send to Canada one or two persons from among themselves

in whose statements they would have confidence, in order to see the Country in general and the localities in particular in which they could obtain lands for settlement, and the terms on which they could obtain them, the Department of Agriculture paying the expenses of such persons while engaged on such Mission.

The Committee submit the above reports and the recommendations they contain for Your Excellency's approval and recommend that a Copy of this Minute be transmitted by Your Excellency to the Earl of Kimberley.

(Clerk of the Privy Council.)

Consul Zohrab to Earl Granville. Berdiansk, May 11, 1872.

Source:

Ibid.

I have the honour to inclose a copy of a letter received by the Chiefs of the Menonites here from Dr. Smith U. S. Consul at Odessa in reply to a letter wherein information regarding the position of immigrants in the United States was requested.

So far as I can learn the answer to the first and most important question asked regarding Military Service is not regarded as satisfactory. The Menonites say that though compulsory service does not exist now, in time of peace, it is not stated that it cannot be easily made to exist in time of war. The reply is regarded as rather waiving the question.

I also inclose copy of an article which appeared in the St. Petersburgh Journal of the 13/25 April, regarding the new Military law and the exemptions proposed by the Military Commission.

Similar articles, I am told, have appeared in the Journals published in German evidently for the purpose of being studied by the persons interested; and they have been I am told, very carefully studied, and I am assured that the conditions offered or proposed are so ambiguously worded, that the impression arrived at is, that they have been purposely drawn out so because they will not be adhered to and the Government will be able easily to change their meaning. In the copy of the article I inclose it will be observed that it is at first stated that the Menonites shall be exempted from military service, then that they have to submit to the conscription but not to bear arms and further, it is declared that the naturalized Menonites will be free from the conscription for 20 years—most of the Menonites are naturalized subjects.

But even were the conditions proposed by the Govt. clearly defined and strictly adhered to, they would not meet with any favor amongst the Mennonites as long as they are mixed up in any way with the conscription. They state that they came into the Country on certain conditions and they demand that those conditions be maintained. They add that they came into a wilderness and turned it by their industry and hard work into a wealth producing country, and rather than abridge their privileges they ought to have been encouraged by the Govt. in their efforts to improve the Country by having those privileges extended. The idea of being obliged to serve in any Military capacity whatever is regarded by the Menonites and all the Germans I believe, with horror

not so much on account of their religious opinions but because they are persuaded that a war between Germany and Russia is not far distant and did they accept the proposed conditions they would then have to serve against their Fatherland.

The reply from G. Q. (?) to their request for information respecting Canada is much looked for by the Menonites who seem to be getting very anxious as to their future fate.

Impatient of waiting for combined action, some of the richer families have already sent persons to America to collect information. Two young men left this country in March for this purpose and two others started last week and it is probable that others will follow. Meetings, I hear, are constantly held, at which members from the various Colonies attend to discuss the project of emigration and latterly, even the means of conveyance to America have been discussed at them, but I am told that the first question invariable asked at these meetings is whether any intelligence has been received from England.

A few days since a Menonite told me that even Russian farm lads now agree on the position of the Germans in Russia and complain of the favor shown to them. They ask why they, the natives of the Country to whom the soil naturally belongs should be shown less favor when they desire to establish villages on the steppe, that they should receive only 10 dessatines of land (27 acres) per man for 5 years while Germans coming in to colonize have 65 dessatines granted to them in perpetuity. The feeling against any distinction being made in favor of foreigners appears to be very general and from what I have been able to observe seems to be strongly supported by the Judicial branch of the Govt. Thus I am led to suppose that however anxious the Govt. may be to maintain their contract with the German Immigrants, they will be obliged to fall in with the national wish and place every one in the country on a perfect footing of equality. The Menonites seem to think thus and hence their desire to arrive at a definite course of action. I forward this despatch by a British steam boat to Constantinople.

John Lowe, Secretary, Department of Agriculture, Ottawa, to Hon. J. C. Aikins, Secretary of State for Canada. May 28, 1872.

Source:

Department of Agriculture, Letter Book Number 6, Pages 33 and 34.

I have the honor in compliance with an instruction of the Hon. the Min. of Agriculture referring to the despatch of the Right Hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies of May 7th last to request, that Her Majesty's Consul at Berdiansk, be informed for the purpose of communication to German Mennonites established in Russia.

First. That the Minister of Agriculture and Public Works of Ontario has sent a communication to this Department to intimate that in the event of one or two persons from the German Menonites in Russia coming to see this Country and the advantages it offers for settlement, as invited under the authority of an order in Council passed in April last, that the Government of the Province of Ontario would be pleased to have the opportunity of rendering them every facility in

obtaining knowledge of the capabilities of that Province, and that some of its members would accompany them personally through the free grant or other districts.

Second. That the Government of Ontario is disposed to deal with the German Menonites in the most liberal manner possible in the event of their determining to emigrate from Russia to that Province.

Third. The Government of Ontario desires that the publications herewith transmitted, descriptive of the resources of that Province, be also forwarded in order to be communicated to the German Menonites in Russia.

And 4th. I am to request that the accompanying pamphlet in the German language, description of the North West Territory of the Dominion be also communicated to the same.

John Lowe, Secretary, Department of Agriculture, Ottawa, to Wm. Hespeler, Special Emigration Agent. June 1, 1872.

Source:

Ibid. pages 35 and 36.

I have the honor to enclose to you herewith a copy of correspondence and the action which has been taken upon it by the Government of Canada with reference to the Emigration of a large body of German Menonites from Russia; and I have an instruction from the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture to request you to proceed immediately on the receipt of this letter to Berdiansk, to put yourself in communication with Her Majesty's Consul there; taking also such further steps as may be considered necessary to promote such emigration from Russia to Canada; furnishing at the same time all the information within your power, respecting the advantages offered by Canada as a field for settlement.

I also enclose to you a copy of a letter [printed above] by me addressed to the Honourable the Secretary of State for the Provinces containing a recital of facilities proposed to be offered by the Province of Ontario to the German Menonites in Russia.

You will please advise this Department as to the probability of the German Menonites sending one or two of their number in whom they have confidence to visit the Dominion at the expense of this Department, in order to report upon the advantages Canada offers as a field for settlement, and the facilities that would be actually afforded to the Immigrants. You will represent that a large portion of the land in the North West Territory is to be given to the Pacific Railway Company during 1873 and that, therefore, it is advisable they should act with as little delay as possible.

You will further please to report your own proceedings under the instruction of this letter.

Cornelius Jansen to Earl Dufferin, Governor General. Berdiansk, June 9, 1872.

Source:

Public Archives of Canada, Papers of the Governor General, Correspondence with the Secretary of State for the Colonies, 1872.

Exzellenz:

Dankbar ist der, durch den hiesigen Consul Ihrer Britischen Majestaet, Herrn Zohrab, uns gewordene Bescheid entgegen genommen. Die trueben Erfahrungen der Gegenwart betreffs unserer Verweigerung der Theilnahme am Militaerdienste, veranlassen uns jedoch zu der ehrerbietigen Bitte an Jhre Exzellenz, uns wenn moeglich umgehend darueber geneigten Bescheid geben zu wollen, wie der Ausdruck zu verstehen ist, wenn es hiess: "Die Mennoniten haben gleich den Quaekern keine Verpflichtung fuer gezwungene Armeedienste, ausgenommen derjenigen, welche aufzulegen der General Gouverneur sich gedrungen fuehlen koennte."

Hieraus erwaechst hier die allgemeine Besorgnis, dass wir dann auch mit vollem Recht bei vermeinter Notwendigkeit zum Armeedienst gezogen werden koennten, worin sich nur das wiederholen wuerde, was hier in Russland und Deutschland auch fuer dringende Notwendigkeit angesehen wird.

Im Auftrage der hiesigen Gemeinde, bitte ich Ew. Exzellenz ganz ergebenst doch kein Misstrauen in dieser Bitte erkennen zu wollen, sondern uns einen klaren Bescheid hierueber zusenden zu lassen.

Ehrerbietigst
Cornelius Jansen

[Translation follows letter of July 26]

Wm. Hespeler, Emigration Agent, to J. H. Pope, Canadian Minister of Agriculture. Strassburg, Germany, July 1, 1872.

Source:

Ibid. Department of Agriculture, General Correspondence, 6462.

[Acknowledges receipt of June 1, 1872 letter]

"Will start for Russia to-morrow. I am in the greatest of hope to meet with success on this important mission and if I am successful in bringing such a worthy class of people (I have been living amongst Mennonites for 20 years) to our country I shall consider my work as a very satisfactory one, at all events the fault shall not lay on my side, should this mission not be crowned with the success I hope for."

"Immigration from Elsass and Lothringen to Canada is greatly checked by the low prices of passage N. Y. steamers are offering while the Allan Line (unfortunately the only one to Quebec) is keeping up their prices."

"New York Lines are taking emigrants from Havre to New York for 80 frcs while the Allan Line is asking 120 frcs from Havre to Quebec —a severe draw back to us . . . ."

I will write you after my arrival at Berdiansk which place to reach will likely take me six days from here.

Wm. Hespeler, Special Emigration Agent, to J. H. Pope, Canadian Minister of Agriculture. Vienna, Austria, July 15, 1872.

Source:

Public Archives of Canada, Department of Agriculture, General Correspondence, 6550.

"I left Strassburg on the 2nd inst., and as I required a passport to enter Russia, I called here at Vienna upon the British Embassy, showing my papers etc. which were however not sufficient! . . ."

[Hespeler at once telegraphed and wrote to the Canadian Dixon Office in London to ask the Foreign Office for passport, telegraphed again after three days but on August 15 was still without reply or passport fearful of losing four days by missing that week's **Sea of Azov Steamer.]**

"The Embassy here treats me with the same indifference as was my mission [as if my mission were] to further the interests of the Duchy of Luxemburg, in fact, his Lordship can only be reached through his ignorant under-secretary, and my private opinion is—the sooner we are an Independent Canada the better."

"I hope to reach Russia before those people have decided upon their future destination. I have the greatest of confidence that my mission will prove a success. The Cholera is at present prevailing in the South of Russia but I hope to escape . . . . After my arrival in Russia I will report my proceedings as soon as possible."

Consul Zohrab to Earl Granville. Berdiansk, July 26, 1872. (*Number 17*)

Source:

Ibid.

I have the honour to transmit, herewith, a letter addressed by Mr. Cornelius Jansen, on the part of the Menonites here, to the Governor General of Canada, requesting an explanation of that part of the Report of the 26th of April from the Committee of the Honourable the Privy Council of Canada which states that

"Any person bearing a certificate from the Society of Menonites shall be exempt from Military Service when balloted in time of peace or war upon such conditions and such regulations as the Governor in Council may from time to time prescribe."

The Menonites are anxious to know clearly to what extent the regulations regarding themselves could be changed or modified by the Governor General in Council, whether they would be exempt from Military Service under all circumstances or whether Military Service could be imposed on them by an Order in Council.

They are desirous to have these points clearly definite as they are to them of the greatest importance hence the letter now addressed by Mr. Jansen.

The conscription drove the Menonites from Prussia. The conscription they are now threatened with is driving them away from Russia and from the Country to which they looked forward as a peaceful home doubt comes on the very same point. They wish to have the doubt explained before they take further steps.

[Enclosure:]

C. Jansen to Governor General of Canada, Berdiansk, June 9, 1872. (*Official Translation*).

The answer given to us by Mr. Zohrab, the British Consul here, has been thankfully received. But the said experience of the present time respecting our refusal to take part in Military Service, induces us to request respectfully that you Excellency will be kindly pleased to inform us by return if possible how the expression is to be understood saying,

"The Menonites like the Quakers are not liable to forced Military Service, excepting such as the Governor General may feel compelled to impose."

From this there arises a general apprehension here that upon alleged necessity, we also might with full legality be drawn into Military Service, wherein there would only be a repetition of what is also considered as pressing necessity here in Russia or Germany.

By direction of the community here, I beg most respectfully that your Excellency will not look upon this request as distrustful, but that you will be pleased to have a clear answer sent to us upon the subject.

Consul Zohrab to Earl Granville. Berdiansk, August 5, 1872. (No. 20.)

Source:

Ibid.

I have to report that Mr. William Hespeler the Agent of the Canadian Government left this for Germany via the Menonite Colonies and Odessa on the 29th ultimo.

Mr. Hespeler called on me on the 28th and he informed me that he had seen and talked with most of the Menonite leaders in this neighbourhood and the conclusion he came to coincided with what I stated to your Lordship in my despatch Consular No. 6 of the 25th of March, that no move will be made till the people are made to feel the change in the Law and then the exodus will be general and hurried.

Mr. Hespeler formed a high opinion of the Menonites he saw and he assured me that they would be a most valuable acquisition to Canada and when they finally decided to quit the Country and had the permission of the Russian Government to do so, every effort should be employed to induce them to select Canada for their future home. He added that he intended suggesting to the Canadian Government the advisability of leaving the management and direction of the movement entirely to me, as he felt persuaded that with my knowledge of the people and Country, and my being, likewise, well known to the Germans, I commanded a position which no other person could acquire immediately.

Should the Canadian Government adopt Mr. Hespeler's suggestion and your Lordship consented to it, I take the liberty to state that I think it would be advisable for me to proceed to Canada as soon as possible, to make myself thoroughly acquainted not alone with the conditions on which the Germans would be received, but with all the details regarding their journey to Canada and to their settlements.

The movement will be either very extensive or of no importance whatever; but taking it in its more probable form—a general departure —it is of importance that I should be in a position to be able to reply

to all enquiries and to meet all contingencies, by possession a thorough knowledge of what has to be done for and by the people from the time of their leaving this to the time they arrive on their lands. I do not think I could attain this position without myself visiting Canada.

Your Lordship will, I trust, pardon the liberty I have taken in making this suggestion; Mr. Hespeler assured me that the Government of Canada are very anxious to have the Germans should they leave Russia; I believe, therefore, I am fulfilling a duty in laying my opinion, as to how that object may be promoted before your Lordship.

Consul Zohrab to Earl Granville, Berdiansk. August 6, 1872. (No. 21.)

Source:

Ibid.

Mr. Jansen, one of the Menonite leaders, called on me yesterday and informed me that Mr. Hespeler had been very well received in the Colonies and had expressed himself much pleased with the appearance and industry of the Colonists.

Mr. Jansen also stated that letters had been received from the Menonites in the Crimea reporting that they and the Lutherans were very dissatisfied with the new laws and wished to quit the country and that they were closely watching the course pursued by the Menonites here; if it resulted in their quitting Russia they would also leave.

A last appeal to the Government is going to be made, a deputation will leave this country in September for the Capital to try and arrive at a decisive conclusion with the Government and I am informed, that on the fate of this deputation will depend the future course of the Menonites. Should evasive replies be given and no well defined promise made which will remove all cause of anxiety, the Menonites will at once send a delegation to America to examine the country both in the United States and in Canada, and it is probable that the emigration will commence seriously next year.

Lord A. Loftus to Earl Granville. St. Petersburgh, August 18, 1872.

Source:

Ibid. 7139.

I have the honor to transmit to your Lordship herewith two despatches as marked in the margin, (Consul Zohrab—Nos. 21 and 22) which I have received under flying seal from Her Majesty's Consul at Berdiansk on the subject of the proposed German Mennonite Emigration.

In the first despatch Mr. Zohrab reports the arrival and departure of an Agent of the Canadian Government—his opinions on the intended emigration of the German Mennonites and the desirableness of the Canadian Government acquiring this valuable population in the event of their deciding finally to emigrate from Russia.

Mr. Zohrab further reports that the Canadian Agent intended to suggest to the Canadian Government the advisability of leaving the management and direction of the movement entirely to him (Zohrab)

as from his position and personal knowledge, he possessed an influence which no other person could immediately acquire.

In his second despatch Mr. Zohrab states that a 1st appeal was on the eve of being made by the German Mennonites to the Imperial Government and that a deputation would be sent for that purpose to St. Petersburgh in September on the result of which the future course of the Mennonites will depend.

From private information which has reached me I am inclined to believe that the Imperial Government will be disposed to grant such a relaxation of the future Military law of service as may satisfy the religious scruples of the German Mennonite Colonies, and that consequently their intended emigration will be abandoned.

I may observe to your Lordship that the leaders of the German Mennonites are on the one hand endeavouring to exercise a pressure on the Imperial Government by a threat of Emigration in order to obtain the fulfilment of their wishes whilst, on the other hand, they are simultaneously in communication with the Governments of Canada and of the United States with a view in case of failure with the Imperial Government to secure the best conditions for their future emigration.

Under these circumstances it would be advisable in my opinion for the Canadian Government as well as Mr. Zohrab to maintain an entirely passive attitude.

All necessary information relating to the reception of the German Mennonites as emigrants in Canada has been, doubtless afforded to them through Mr. Hespeler the Canadian Agent; and I consider that any further action taken in the matter by Mr. Zohrab may lead to complications with the Imperial Government.

The suggestion of Mr. Hespeler that H. M. Consul should be charged with the management and direction of this emigration movement will place him in a false position and may possibly compromise him with the Imperial Authorities who will look upon him as an emigration agent endeavouring to induce a large population of Russian subjects to quit the Russian territory.

I cannot therefore concur in the opinion expressed by Mr. Zohrab that it would be advisable for him to proceed to Canada as soon as possible with a view to making arrangements for the reception of these emigrants and for their journey to Canada.

I am of opinion that any such application for assistance should emanate from the emigrants themselves when they have once finally announced their intention, and have received the permission of the Imperial Government to leave Russia. From the concluding paragraph of Mr. Zohrab's despatch No. 21, it would appear that this is the view taken by the Germans themselves, for he states that "in the event of the deputation to St. Petersburgh being unfavourable the Mennonites will at once send a delegation to America to examine the Country both in the United States and in Canada."

I am of opinion therefore that Mr. Zohrab having informed the German Mennonites of the willingness of the Canadian Government to receive them and the terms on which they will be received as emigrants he should abstain from making any further advances to them. They appear to have a keen eye for their own interests, and should they

finally decide on emigration (which I very much doubt) will be governed in the selection of their future home by the advantages which may be offered to them.

Wm. Hespeler, Emigration Agent, to J. H. Pope, Minister of Agriculture, Ottawa. Strassburg, Germany, August 28, 1872.

Source:

Public Archives of Canada. Department of Agriculture, General Correspondence, Number 6800.

I arrived at Berdiansk (S. Russia) On the 25th of July last, and my first call was upon the British Consul Mr. Zohrab as directed by you.

His (Zohrab's) first question was!—if I was in possession of instructions to him from Lord Granville? which question I had to answer in the negative! to which he replied, that he shall deem it his duty to keep quite separate from me, as a contrary cause could bring him in a very difficult position, which he could not assume without Lord Granville's direct orders. Of course by that I was no little surprised, as I expected that he (the Consul) had received instructions from the Foreign office in regard to me and my mission.—He advised me to leave Russia without delay, as on account of a telegram I had addressed to him, my object was known to the authorities, (having had signed myself, "Agent for the Canadian Government") and I would certainly be arrested, in which case he could do nothing for me.—I knew very well that in Russia the penalties imposed upon such, who further emigration are very severe, but after having once made that long and tedious voyage, I felt not inclined to give up, and return without having made an effort, and felt determined to risk the consequences.—

Not being pleased with the Consul's conduct, especially as I had reason to fear that he had also some other object in keeping me away I begged him for directing me to one of the leading Mennonites in the Town, to which he complied.—My first acquaintance was with a Mr. **Jansen** who is residing in Berdiansk where there are only a very limited number, and by him I was received in a most welcome manner. Mr. **Jansen** took me to all the other members of the congregation, and by every one I was treated with the greatest attention—after having seen all the principal parties, all of which took the greatest interest in my mission, I thought it advisable to leave town, and go to the Colonies where these Menonites are spread over hundreds of miles pursuing agriculture. I was recommended from place to place, and for the greatest part accompanied by one or two of their Members—in this way I travelled for twelve days, until I reached the last Colony.

The greatest number I found living on Crown land, about 180 acre lots, and quite a number on their own lands, which consist in many cases of plantations from 4 to 10,000 acres, raising principally sheep, cattle and horses.

As in those extensive Colonies the Police is limited in numbers, and being careful not to make my cause known, outside the leading parties, I was successful in delivering my mission by bringing before them the exemption from Military Service, the advantages offered by

the Canadian Government as regards free grants of land, and in giving all further information in my power respecting the prosperity awaiting them in Canada. My offers and informations were most favourably received, and I received the assurance from all sides, that the selection of Canada for their future home is the most favourable one in view—the offer to send two Members from among themselves to visit Canada on the expense of your Department made an impression of great confidence, and as soon as the next deputation which is going to be sent to St. Petersburgh in October next, with a petition to the Emperor, should return (as expected) with a refusal to their prayer, they will decide at once, and nothing will prevent them from leaving their well established homes. In such case they will take advantage of the offer made by your department, and will send a deputation of two of their members to Canada, to report upon the localities and advantages the Dominion offers,—they will write to me at the proper time, for me to furnish them letters to your Department, and to give them all other necessary informations.

If they return with a favourable account there will be hundreds of the most wealthy families ready to leave next summer. The majority are still in hopes that the Government in St. Petersburgh will decide in their favour, but the leading men seem to be fully persuaded that the decision will turn against them—in the latter case, they will get the privilege to emigrate up to the year 1882. They are a hardy, industrious, orderly and intelligent race, and they would prove a valuable acquisition to Canada, their villages are patterns of order and industry, large orchards and gardens spring up where originally could not be found a tree; their intention is, to obtain contiguous lots of land, so as to form their own communities.

I called their attention in particular to Manitoba, which Province I am convinced through my experience I gained amongst them, would suit them best, as the country they are now living in, is entirely level, and they are not accustomed to the use of the ax.

Some three weeks before I left for Russia I forwarded a large case filled with German pamphlets to my address to Berdiansk, but they never arrived, and it is now certain that the Russian Government seized them, as they came across their lines, which I very much regretted, as it deprived me of a great advantage. I have, however, since sent a number of pamphlets to the leading parties by mail, which perhaps may reach their destination.

They have promised to keep me informed of their movements as soon as their deputation returns from St. Petersburgh, and I have assured them of rendering them all possible assistance and information. The long distance from that part of Russia to the Atlantic Ocean will be a matter of great inconvenience to the Emigrants, and I think it will be necessary to send steamers from Liverpool to the Black Sea, as the poorer classes could not afford the very expensive land voyage—this is however a matter to arrange, when once they have decided to emigrate.

(To be continued)

BOOK REVIEW

The Church Against the World. By H. Richard Niebuhr, Wilhelm Pauck and Francis P. Miller. Willett, Clark and Co. New York and Chicago, 1935. PP 156. $2.00.

The author of this book believes that the Christian church confronts a worldliness within and without which threatens to destroy it. The paramount issue of today is not, "What can the church do to save civilization?" but rather, "What can the church do to save itself?" It is time to cease criticising the church for not adjusting itself sufficiently to the world and its needs. The church has adjusted itself too much to the world, and must turn away from temporal to eternal relations.

The body of the book is divided into three parts. Part I, "The Crisis of Religion," is by William Pauck, who sees the worldliness confronting the church as a secularism which from the time of the crusades to the present day has drawn civilization steadily away from God. Its beginning can be seen in the rise of the towns which marked a new economic spirit. Later the Renaissance contributed some pagan elements. The age of the enlightenment was critical and skeptical and today we have reached an age of atheism. For centuries civilization has been steadily drawing away from God until today it "is disintegrating because it does not correspond to the divine . . . order of things."

In the past, this process of disintegration has been held in check by religious forces which arose to the occasion. In the post-crusading era an antidote for secularism was found in the wave of pietism following St. Francis of Assisi. During the critical period of the Renaissance and Reformation the reformers solved the problem by distinguishing between visible and invisible forms of the church. When the eighteenth century enlightenment rejected Christianity as a supernatural revelation, theologians interpreted Christianity's claim as the true faith to mean that its moral standards were higher than those of other religions. But today even this support is being destroyed—the absoluteness of Christianity in morals is being questioned. "There has emerged a secularism which claims to represent the same high moral ideals that Christianity does, but without dependence upon the religious beliefs which are characteristic of the church (p. 33). "It is an atheistic movement which claims to cultivate moral ideals of the same value as those defended by the church" (p. 33). Man can lead the good life without believing in God.

This secularism has radically affected theology. Formerly the existence of God was taken for granted and exhortations followed this assumption. But most modern sermons are arguments for a belief in God. So the "church is face to face with a powerful opponent." This opponent has invaded even the mission field. In 1910 the Edinburgh missionary conference still looked forward to the evangelization of the world. But in 1928 at the Jerusalem conference Christianity

was joining hands with other religions to combat a common enemy, the spirit of secularism.

What is needed today is a prophet who "will speak to us in the name of the living God with such power and authority that all who long for salvation will be compelled to listen" (p. 69). The author does not believe this prophet is to be found in the ranks of any of the religious schools demanding our attention today—that is, the Fundamentalists, the Humanists, the Modernists, the Barthians, or the Buchmanites.

In Part II, Francis P. Miller treats of "American Protestantism and the Christian Faith." Mr. Miller finds in nationalism the most pernicious form of that secularism which confronts the church. Today nationalism is militant, promoting a national culture and a national religion which threaten to destroy Christianity.

The content of the true Christian faith is not man-made, and it cannot change. It is given by God and must remain the same. It asks all men everywhere to worship a creator not identified with, but over and above the universe. This is what makes Christianity a universal religion. The form, or medium, through which this faith is expressed may vary, of course, being conditioned by the age. But whenever the form of faith takes precedence over the content, then faith begins to expire.

In the sixteenth century static ecclesiastic forms had taken precedence over the Christian faith. Then, through the Reformation, Protestants won their liberty from this enslavement. But today they are "in process of being enslaved by their respective national cultures and it remains to be seen whether their last estate may not be worse than their first" (p. 84). Protestants all over the world are more interested in the cultural form of their faith than in its content. So it is a real question whether Protestantism will survive as a reliable witness of the Christian faith.

In the Middle Ages, despite the over-emphasis on ecclesiastic forms, the concept of Christendom served as a frame of reference which preserved the universality of the Christian religion. The eighteenth century enlightenment then degraded this concept to a mere cosmopolitan European culture. Since then, a degree of universality has been maintained due to the existence of a common western culture and to a widespread acceptance of the Bible. But today both of these universal frames of reference are diminishing in influence and a national frame of reference is taking its place.

In Germany it was the religious liberals who unwittingly prepared the way for this national religion. And in the United States the same thing is true, Professor John Dewey being "the high priest of the movement." Not that Dewey desires to promote a narrow nationalism. He believes in a universal community and his educational program has this end in view. But he makes his mistake in hoping to build his universal community on the basis of an "enlightened imagination." For the imagination cannot form the basis for a common faith. It may form the basis for a common class faith or national faith, but not for a universal faith. "It cannot do this simply because it is man's imagination, and the social environment conditions man's imagination

more than any other single factor." (p. 108). And if the dominant forces are national forces, then the imagination will reflect the national ethos.

The weakest point in Dewey's philosophy is the fact that it is based on Rousseau's doctrine of the natural goodness of man. If man were naturally good, then one might be satisfied with a religion derived from the human imagination. But Rousseau's doctrine is false. It "has made man himself the end-all and be-all of existence." And as long as man lives for himself the world will be filled "with the cults of blood and race and nation." "In so far as that doctrine continues to dominate Western thought we may expect the recurring horrors of war and revolution, because it is a doctrine whose logic deprives mankind of a common frame of reference and in the end sets every man against every other man" (pp. 110-111).

H. Richard Niebuhr contributes the third part of the book, "Toward the Independence of the Church." Professor Niebuhr tells us the history of the church moves in cycles. First, a converted church withdraws from a corrupt civilization; second, from its retreat it sends out a stream of evangelism; third, when it finds signs of repentance it relaxes its rigorism and lives at peace with the culture of the age; fourth, the faith then loses its force and corruption sets in; fifth, there is a fresh withdrawal, followed by fresh aggression and the cycle is repeated. This process has been repeated three times within the church, in ancient, in medieval and modern times. Today the church, therefore, must liberate herself from a corrupt civilization once more.

The essence of worldliness is the worship of civilization, a creation of man. This is a more dangerous form of idolatry than that of primitive people, which at least looks to some outside source for help. The anthropocentricism of our day which regards evil as a mere lack of development has brought the church into bondage to contemporary civilization, particularly as experienced in capitalism and nationalism.

Against this bondage there are signs of revolt within the church—a revolt against civilization and against a secularized church. This revolt is not yet well formulated. It is vague and uncertain in its strategy, resulting sometimes in blind enthusiasms. This confusion makes for perils because there are also other forces engaged in revolt. Hence the church is in danger of allying itself, in the revolt, with forces which jeopardize itself. Church leaders are too prone to identify the Gospel with the programs of radical political parties. The so-called German Christian movement which confuses the Gospel and nationalism had its sources in a reaction against an individualistic profit-seeking civilization. And American Christians in their reaction against similar conditions are in danger of forming a political alignment of the same kind which was formed in Germany. If they succumb to this danger the result will be a new tyranny. "It is one thing for Christians to take a responsible part in the political life of their nation; it is another thing to identify the Gospel and its antagonism to the 'world' with the 'worldly' antagonism of some revolting group" (p. 145).

If the church therefore desires freedom from her present bondage, she can obtain it only through a renewed loyalty to God. "There is no flight out of the captivity of the church save into the captivity of God." This loyalty to the great "I am that I am" is the "beginning of true emancipation" as well as "the only reason for the church's existence." The social gospel, so popular during the past generation, will not do. "If the church has no other plan of salvation to offer to men than one of deliverance by force, education, idealism or planned economy, it really has no existence as a church and needs to resolve itself into a political party or a school" (p. 151).

These three stimulating analyses are evidence of an awareness among us that not all is well with contemporary Christianity. That the authors are still suffering from the influence of their own liberal religious background is evident from the attitude assumed toward Fundamentalism and the newer Barthianism. Evidently, none of them is ready to accept the complete authority of the Scriptures. And apparently, they cannot reconcile themselves to "a restoration of confessional Protestant theology" (p. 63). But that they give to theology the place they do is a hopeful sign. Clearly they see that the church cannot continue in her present course and survive. Mr. Miller significantly points out that the American church must distinguish more clearly between her primary and secondary tasks. In the past, major emphasis has often been placed upon promotion of particular programs, reforms, moralities, and social formulas. These, the authors point out, must be regarded as secondary tasks, while the primary task of the church is to recreate a belief in the reality of Christianity, developing a frame of reference including a Christian theology, a Christian society, and a Christian ethic.

Goshen, Indiana. Guy F. Hershberger.

EDITORIAL

(Continued from page 170)

not conscientious readiness to apply it even among representative historians of the group. A striking example is given in the valuable criticism rendered by John Horsch on W. J. Kuehler's *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Doopsgezinden in de Zestiende Eeuw*, Harlem, 1932 (*Mennonite Quarterly Review*, January, April 1933 numbers) under the title, "Is Dr. Kuehler's conception of early Dutch Anabaptism historically sound?" (Also issued in pamphlet form by the Mennonite Press, Scottdale, Pennsylvania). In this case the facts and factors of an earlier period were apparently in part reconstructed and reinterpreted to fit them to the particular outlook and philosophy of the author, Kuehler. Rejoinders and debates of this sort would become less necessary if, once and for all, the basic data of Anabaptist-Mennonite history could be assembled and compiled in "neutral" historical source collections. Both the editors of our series and contributors are on the lookout for ample and reliable checks on original material. At times efforts in this direction may merely result in "trial" or preliminary publications, as in the case of H. S. Bender's extended series of articles covering *Mennonitica Americana* which were published in the *Mennonite Quarterly Review* before the comprehensive bibliography appeared in book form in 1929 as Number 1 of *The Studies in Anabaptist and Mennonite History*. The present plan of an issue of a "List of Names" covering Swiss Mennonite families living in the Palatinate in the 17th and 18th centuries should prove to be of similar service preparatory to scientifically annotated lists. Genealogical data are in growing demand here and abroad. Why not gather all that has been compiled so far, submit it to searchers and the general public whose reaction may clear up many a point, name or connection. Experience shows that "trial" publications are of constructive value, for they make additional inquiries easier and make more possible ultimately a *definitive* picture of historical subjects or topics otherwise held ideal but not always considered feasible.

It should also be noted here that it would be advisable to exercise greater restraint so as to prevent appearance of final publications as long as relevant source material has not been fully exhausted. Additional research and corrective writing on subjects dealt with in book form could well be avoided through a comprehensive checking beforehand. In other words, the ideal of a *definitive* picture should, if at all possible, be kept in mind. Of course, even the most thorough search cannot eliminate "unexpected" new or contributory explanatory sources. Similarly, new types or styles of interpretation may in due time suggest and require revised editions or revamped presentations. In the course of research additional opportunities for source-studies suggest themselves very naturally. I may here refer to more specific observations made in my review and appraisal of H. S. Bender's *Two Centuries of American Mennonite Literature* in *Mennonite Quarterly Review*, January and October, 1930, as well as in articles on "The Value of Family History for Mennonite History" (*Review*, January, April, and July, 1928) and on "The Value of Hymns for Mennonite History" (*Review*, July, 1930) —E. C.